

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XL

NOVEMBER, 1925

NUMBER 7

GIBBON EN HONGRIE: PREMIERES TRACES

(d'après des documents inédits)

On a étudié en 1916 l'action qu'a pu avoir Gibbon—assez tard—sur quelques écrivains hongrois, Teleki László, Szigligeti, Madách, Jókai. Noms auxquels M. Fest Sándor ajoutait, l'année suivante, comme indices de simple notoriété préalable, ceux de Desseffy, Kazinczy, puis Döbrentei.¹ C'est le début de cette influence hongroise que l'on constatera ici, d'après des mémoires encore inédits, écrits en français par un Hongrois notoire qui mourut en 1803.

Plusieurs pages de ces Mémoires, rédigés à larges intervalles durant une retraite prolongée, semblent pouvoir se dater par la mention qui y est faite d'un événement, d'une publication. Il devrait en être de même de celles-ci. Mais l'auteur hongrois n'a connu Gibbon que par une traduction dont on ne sait quand elle commença de paraître. En sorte que son témoignage aiderait peut-être à la dater elle même, approximativement.

Publiée à Londres de 1776 à 1788, rééditée de 1788 à 1790, l'*History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* ne devait avoir qu'en 1824 sa traduction fragmentaire en hongrois. Malgré des relations anciennes entre calvinistes hongrois et protestants anglais, même des voyages de théologiens hongrois, transylvains surtout, jusqu'en Angleterre par la Hollande, et la constitution à Debrecen d'un centre d'influence théologique anglaise, l'éloignement, la difficulté des communications firent longtemps qu'en ce pays de bons traducteurs la littérature anglaise fut des

¹ M. Vértessy Jenő dans *Irodalomtörténet*: Gibbon mint szépirodink forrása (p. 16-30).—Fest Sándor, *Angol irodalmi Hatások hazánkban*, p. 95.

littératures étrangères la moins connue,—sauf, au dernier tiers du XVIIIe siècle, quelques œuvres de “docteurs anglais.” Quelle qu’eût été à Vienne, vers la première moitié du règne de Joseph II, puis, par contact, au pays magyar, la vogue de l’Angleterre, modes, chevaux, *lads*, Anglais de passage à qui les dames de l’aristocratie viennoise ouvraient leurs cœurs “à deux battants,”² et quoique les traductions d’ouvrages anglais à Vienne eussent paru menacer alors l’influence littéraire de la France,³ la pratique de l’anglais ne commença de se répandre en Hongrie qu’au premier quart du XIXe siècle. On l’enseignait à l’Université de Pest vers 1806. Mais, bien que quelques Hongrois lettrés aient voyagé en Angleterre, les deux Berzevicy, les Eszterházy, Szechenyi Ferenc et plus tard Szechenyi István, les deux Teleki, Sándor István, et d’autres peut-être, les premiers écrivains de Hongrie sympathiques à l’Angleterre, même les membres de la Société Anglaise qui se fonde à Kassa, comme Bacsányi, Kazinczy, sont de bien médiocres anglicisants. Certains, comme Kis János, avaient pris une teinture d’anglais à l’Université hanovrienne de Goettingen, fondée par George III. C’est en Allemagne aussi que Döbrentei Gábor plus tard apprendra l’anglais. Mais il faut attendre la génération qui arrive à la vie littéraire vers 1820, pour voir un Vörösmarty lisant les poètes anglais dans le texte, un Kölcsey se mettant brusquement à l’anglais entre 1813 et 1815. Jusqu’alors on cite pour leur connaissance de l’anglais Péczeli József, qui semble avoir été le premier poète hongrois dans ce cas, ou Palácz Horváth Adám.⁴

Il n’est donc pas étonnant que Gibbon soit entré en Hongrie par une voie détournée.

Son œuvre avait été mise en français dès 1777 (jusqu’à 1791) avec la collaboration du futur Louis XVI, assure-t-on; et Benjamin Constant aussi projeta de le traduire.⁵ Il y eut une traduc-

² Fekete, *Esquisse d’un Tableau mouvant de Vienne* (1787), p. 43 et suiv.

³ Fest Sándor, *Angol irodalmi Hárások hazánkban* (1917), p. 12, 14, 34, cf. 4-10 pour la théologie. Cf. Marki Sándor, *Cromwell és Erdély* (Erdélyi Múzeum, 1901), p. 16 et suiv.

⁴ Fest S., *ibid.*, p. 15: 45, 43, 10, 38, 80, 52. Cf. du même *Adalékok az angol nyelv terfoglalásához hazánkban 1848 előtt*, dans *Egyetemes Philológiai Közlöny* de juin-décembre 1921, p. 128. Cf. Marczali Henrik, *Gróf Szechenyi István és Anglia*, dans *Magyar Figyelő*, 1913, II, p. 161.

⁵ G. Rudler, *Bibliographie critique de B. Constant*, p. 95.

tion allemande dès 1790. Mais le Hongrois que nous citerons n'a été initié à Gibbon par aucune de ces deux traductions. Il a connu la version italienne qui se publia sous le nom d'Angelo Fabroni, ancien précepteur des fils du grandduc de Toscane, *provveditore* de l'Université de Venise, polygraphe et savant en renom, qui avait voyagé en France et en Angleterre (1772), puis en Allemagne et en Autriche. Fabroni fit-il autre chose que diriger cette entreprise de librairie? On semble avoir vu d'assez mauvais œil, à Rome, selon le *Dizionario di Opere anonime e pseudonime di scrittori Italiani*, qu'un prélat s'occupât d'un travail semblable. Après sa mort (1803) ce qui restait de l'édition fut vendu au poids. Et c'est en 1823 seulement qu'une seconde traduction italienne de Gibbon verra le jour à Milan, non sans une *Confutazione* en règle de Spedalieri.

Nulle date n'est indiquée pour la publication de la version qui porte le nom de Fabroni. Le fait qu'elle semble être mentionnée la première en Hongrie, et non la traduction allemande ou la française, doit-il être interprété comme un indice qu'elle serait antérieure à l'une et à l'autre, à l'allemande en tout cas?

II

Notre auteur, le comte Jean Fekete de Galántha, a voyagé en Italie, séjourné en Autriche italienne, à Trieste notamment et par deux fois, connu Métastase à Vienne, traduit plusieurs chants de l'*Orlando furioso*. Il admirait la langue italienne, comme incomparablement plus propre à la musique, à l'opéra, que l'allemand ou même le français. Il semble l'avoir bien parlée, puisque, peu après la mort de Joseph II, c'est en italien qu'il adressa la parole à la reine.*

Mais il eût pu tout aussi bien lire Gibbon en français. Les seules œuvres qu'il ait imprimées, son *Esquisse d'un Tableau mouvant de Vienne* (1787) et ses deux volumes de *Rapsodies*, prose et vers (1781), sont en français, d'un français très passable. De même ses *Œuvres Posthumes* inédites, de même des lettres de lui au prince de Ligne, et d'autres, souvent mentionnées, à Voltaire, "Papa grand homme" comme il le nommait volontiers plus tard, qui ne dédaigna pas de lui répondre, à plusieurs reprises, de lui

* Kazinczy Ferenc, *Pályám Emlékezete*, pp. Abafi, III, 154.

corriger quelques vers, de lui envoyer ses œuvres, et fut pour lui non pas toutes les lettres françaises, mais la fleur des lettres françaises comme de l'esprit humain.

D'autre part, s'il préféra délibérément Voltaire et le français, s'il "nagea" dans la culture française, au dire du critique hongrois Riedl,⁷ il sut l'allemand fort bien, comme ancien élève du *Theresianum* de Vienne, puis stagiaire aux Gardes du Corps, et officier de l'armée impériale. Volontiers il affecte de n'en avoir guère usé que pour du "baragouinage de service." Mais il traduit diverses choses allemandes, publie même à Dessau, en 1782, des *Bruchstücke* introuvables aujourd'hui, qui appellent une réponse allemande "Sur la perfectibilité de la Religion révélée." Il connut bien l'Allemagne, tout au moins l'Allemagne francisante de Wieland et de la tragédie fidèle aux règles. Et comme pendant à la spirituelle figure de Voltaire, la figure de son royal ami et correspondant français Frédéric II, "l'Unique," s'imposa toujours à l'admiration de Fekete János.

A ce bon polyglotte qui fut assez bon latiniste aussi, l'anglais pourtant manqua. Il était de la génération de Bessenyei, qui lisait les auteurs anglais en traductions françaises, de même que beaucoup de compatriotes, à Vienne ou Pest, en traductions allemandes. Il n'a guère cité Milton qu'à propos de Voltaire (bien qu'une lettre inédite le montre essayant de lire dans le texte le *Paradis perdu*),⁸ ni le régulier Addison que pour l'opposer à Shakespeare, qu'il juge au patron de la tragédie française. Hobbes, qu'il lui arrive de nommer sur l'homme primitif, faisait depuis longtemps partie du domaine commun. Et quand il parle de Locke, c'est en notes à sa traduction manuscrite du poème *De la Loi Naturelle*, de Voltaire encore. Sur le tard, il fit grand cas de la constitution anglaise, par contraste aux horreurs de notre Révolution. Au regard de la pesanteur germanique, il eut alors de l'"estime" pour les Anglais "malgré leurs bizarreries." Et c'est un assez curieux indice de l'évolution des goûts littéraires nationaux, que de voir Fekete János conseiller à son fils, lorsqu'il semble se mettre à la poésie lui aussi, de lire Horace, Voltaire et les Anglais.⁹

⁷ Article de 1904 dans *Budapesti Szemle*, tome 118, p. 140.

⁸ Fekete János, *Magyar Munkái* (inédites), I, 169.

⁹ Morvay (Győző), *Galántai Graf Fekete János*, Budapest (1903), p. 210.

Vers la même époque de sa vie, sans doute, son attention fut attirée par Gibbon. Et l'on se doute un peu de ce que ce Voltairien hongrois trouve de capital dans l'œuvre historique anglaise traduite sous la direction d'un *monsignore* italien.

III

Voici ce qui est dit de Gibbon aux "Petites Réflexions" (no. CIX) qui font la seconde partie des *Œuvres Posthumes* inédites du comte Fekete János. Quelques phrases sembleront un peu lourdes. Mais sauf des corrections légères d'orthographe ou de ponctuation, nous n'y changerons rien :

"De tout temps, les bigots ont cherché à jeter sur les génies supérieurs qui éclairaient de temps en temps ce monde qu'ils voulaient maintenir dans l'ignorance, un vernis d'incrédulité et même d'athéisme; ils ont rendu par là un très mauvais service à la religion, comme le remarque Papa Grand Homme au sujet des Encyclopédistes, puisqu'ils donnaient lieu de croire qu'on ne pouvait être un génie et la croire (la religion); le clergé d'Italie en a agi avec la même imprudence avec M. Gibbon, que l'Abbé Fabroni, cet ami du Philosophe couronné, de ce Léopold II mort trop tôt pour le bonheur du monde, a si élégamment et si exactement traduit. Ils n'ont rien eu de plus pressé que de réfuter, de calomnier cet Ecrivain si judicieux, cet émule de Tacite, qui n'a pas pu supprimer les vérités historiques moins favorables, surtout au Culte Catholique, mais qui en revanche peint si bien ce Julien, défiguré par ses panégyristes, ainsi que par les satires orthodoxes des Saints Pères. S'il lui rend justice comme soldat, comme Empereur, il ne cache pas sa pédantesque manie pour le Polythéisme, que Julien s'efforçait de rétablir sur les débris d'un culte au moins plus raisonnable, quand même il aurait déjà souffert quelques altérations, de son temps, de la primitive pureté de son modeste et divin fondateur.

"C'est Gibbon qui nous dévoile l'énigme d'un Empereur Philosophe, élevé au sein du Christianisme que l'initiation rend fanatique; qui dans l'instant où l'Hiérophante (supposé que les grands mystères se soient conservés sans tache jusqu'à cette époque) lui dévoile l'unité de Dieu, et l'explication hiéroglyphico-physique du Polythéisme, en devient l'Énergumène; ce qui jeta sur les vrais

Philosophes de l'antiquité le soupçon d'Athéisme, si peu mérité (car ils n'étaient que Déistes dans l'acception la plus naturelle de ce mot) fut précisément ce qui rendit Julien fanatique d'une religion dont Socrate et ses disciples connaissaient si bien l'absurdité littérale.

"Comment peut-on concevoir que Julien, si grand quand il ne se piquait pas de faire le Théologien, qui se refusait aux miracles d'une Religion qui accompagna son berceau, ait cru au(x) prodiges, et plus absurdes et moins prouvés, du paganisme? qu'il ait eu foi aux augures, que tout imposteur à manteau philosophique ait trouvé accès à sa Cour somme à son cœur, qu'en un mot il se soit persuadé d'avoir commerce avec ces êtres d'un genre supérieur, auxquels le Polythéisme érigeait des autels? et tout cela est cependant vrai au pied de la lettre, est irrévocablement prouvé par ce Gibbon qu'on croit un ennemi acharné du Christianisme. Que Frédéric l'Unique le surpasse en tout (l'empereur Julien)! Plus grand général que Julien, l'émule de César en guerre, il l'était de Socrate en philosophie, et quelquefois d'Horace en poésie; puisse-t-il trouver un Gibbon pour écrire sa vie.

"C'est un bonheur pour ces pays, que les deux Cardinaux actuellement régnants ne lisent guère; car l'un d'eux surtout serait bien fait pour comprendre ce qu'il lit; certainement ils auraient mis Gibbon s'ils l'avaient connu, à la tête de ces livres dont ils défendent la publicité avec tant d'acharnement; il est vrai que Gibbon n'est pas une lecture de toilette, qu'il faut savoir penser pour le lire, que par conséquent il ne peut être dangereux chez nous que pour un très petit nombre de personnes, que les gens en place, surtout, sont à l'abri d'un poison trop subtil pour leurs organes matériels."

Que Gibbon n'ait pas été une "lecture de toilette," comme ce Chaulieu, fort prisé de Fekete,

. . . . dont les vers gracieux
Des belles charmaient la toilette
Ainsi que la table des Dieux,¹⁰

on en conviendra sans peine. Le mépris que notre auteur fait là de ses compatriotes incapable de "penser" n'a rien qui doive sur-

¹⁰ Fekete János, *Mes Rapsodies*, I, 38.

prendre, d'un *philosophe* qui volontiers, parlant de la Diète où il jouera un rôle, s'y rangeait au parti sacrifié des *penseurs*.¹¹ Et jusqu'assez tard, par admiration pour des natures plus cultivées, pour la France de Voltaire surtout, il a parlé sans indulgence de sa "pauvre patrie, . . . sale et barbare," à la renaissance littéraire de laquelle pourtant il contribuera de son mieux, avant sa fin; de ce "pays affreux,

Que l'ignorance et la pédanterie
S'entredisputent tous les jours";

comme des "lourds Allemands" d'Autriche, et de la "ville ignare" qu'était Vienne, "peu fertile en talents," où on lit peu, l'on pense peu, où le peuple est "engourdi dans une épaisse balourdise." . . .

Un bibliothécaire du Nemzeti Múzeum de Budapest a bien voulu consulter pour moi les *schematismi* des diocèses hongrois: ils indiquent pour cette époque un seul cardinal hongrois, celui de Gran ou Esztergom, qui de 1776 à 1799 fut le comte Joseph Batthyány: Fekete a fait, en vers, grand éloge de son libéralisme. Faut-il donc entendre, par les deux prélats si peu curieux d'esprit de "ces malheureux pays," un cardinal autrichien aussi bien qu'un hongrois?

Peu importe en somme, non plus que de savoir jusqu'à quel point l'abbé Fabroni fut l' "ami" du Philosophe Couronné dont il avait eu les enfants comme élèves en Toscane. La lecture du *Gibbon* de Fabroni est simplement, pour Fekete, matière à reprendre la série de ses variations sur un thème familier, auquel il se tint à peu près toute sa vie, un thème voltairien.

Comme lancé par Gibbon, notre auteur continue de plus belle (no. CX): "La Bigotterie est un torrent grossi par l'avarice et l'envie de dominer sacerdotales; dès qu'elle parvient à rompre les digues que le bon sens lui oppose, elle se déborde et devient dangereuse aux états qui ont eu la faiblesse de laisser percer cette digue; elle n'est point fille de la Religion, mais bien de la superstition; car la sœur aînée de la saine Philosophie, qui descendit avec elle du ciel pour consoler, pour apprivoiser l'homme brut, ne saurait avoir produit un monstre qui sape l'autel, l'ordre civil et

¹¹ Id., *Œuvres Posthumes* inédites, *Petites Réflexions*, no. XL.

moral, ainsi que tout pouvoir légitime; c'est les pilliers de la bigoterie judaïque, ces infâmes pharisiens, ces indignes descendants du frère de Moïse, qui furent les ennemis les plus acharnés de Jésus-Christ; c'est leurs imitateurs qui le crucifient encore chaque jour, en infectant ses dogmes sacrés de l'alliage impur de leur fanatisme; quand viendra-t-il, ce temps heureux où les deux sœurs célestes, entrelaçant leurs bras, pourront concourir ensemble à élaguer les maux innombrables du meilleur des mondes possibles? quand verra-t-on le Christianisme épuré, qui n'est que la plus sublime philosophie, régner sans partage sur l'univers éclairé par le flambeau de sa sœur?"

Au début de ses *Œuvres Posthumes*, il invoque ainsi Jésus:

"Philosophe sans fard! Déiste vertueux!
 Fléau de l'Hypocrite! appui du malheureux!
 Plus grand que Confuzé, plus sage que Socrate,
 C'est en tes actions que ta morale éclate. . . .
 Portant de rudes coups au cruel Judaïsme,
 Tu fis évanouir l'absurde Paganisme. . . .
 Sans préjugé, j'admire en toi l'homme et le sage. . . .
 Le Prêtre et le Lévite ont conspiré la mort:
 T'invoquant, à tout sage ils font le même sort."

Pour ce médiocre poète et ce *philosophe* convaincu, le "christianisme épuré" auquel il se dit "revenu par conviction" se concilie fort bien avec la haine pour l' "envie de dominer sacerdotale" qui fut, comme on sait, dès avant la publication du *Dictionnaire Philosophique*, une sorte de mot d'ordre voltairien: plus d'une lettre à Frédéric II, à d'Alembert, à Damilaville, en témoignerait. Avec la haine des "préjugés" aussi: en "esprit-fort de bonne foi," Fekete leur avait une fois pour toutes déclaré la guerre, comme aux "bigots timorés," aux bigots de toutes Eglises, nombreuses en Hongrie, "soit Catholique Romaine, soit Orientale, soit Réformée, soit Protestante." Enfin, avec la haine du "cruel fanatisme," dont la Philosophie seule "émousse le poignard," dont les ennemis sont ses héros, et que l'âge ne lui fait point paraître moins "dégoûtant."¹²

Le *Mahomet* de Voltaire avait pour titre exact: "le Fanatisme, ou Mahomet le Prophète." La fin de l'*Histoire de Jenni*, par

¹² Fekete János, *Œuvres Posthumes inédites, Petites Réflexions*, xxvii.

exemple, montrait dans l'athéisme et le fanatisme "les deux pôles d'un monde de confusion et d'horreur. La petite zone de la vertu est entre ces deux pôles. . . ." Et dans une autre pièce de vers, *Sur l'Égypte*, le voltairien Fekete János voit retrouvé déjà, grâce aux monuments égyptiens,

Le fil interrompu par tant de charlatans . . .

C'est le déchiffrement de tes hiéroglyphes

Qui de tout fanatisme allait rogner les griffes. . . .

Et l'on sait par l'ouvrage de M. Marczali Henrik, sur la diète hongroise de 1790-91, qu'on y discuta souvent, avec passion, des méfaits du fanatisme.¹³ Or Fekete en fut, et dut alors croire l'heure venue pour lui de jouer enfin le rôle auquel s'était dérobée une vie militaire assez morne et prématurément brisée. Il y fit presque figure d'un Mirabeau, nous dit-on: pour d'autres, d'un novateur dangereux, d'une sorte de révolutionnaire suspect.

Ne fut-il pas, au moins autant, question du fanatisme à la Loge "Harmonie et Concorde Universelle" à Trieste? Dès 1784 un Fekete "vieux maçon" y tient des discours en français, les réunit en une brochure vendue un florin au bénéfice d'une famille pauvre, à qui devait aller aussi le produit des travaux littéraires antérieurs de l'auteur. Quoi qu'en ait pensé l'historien de la maçonnerie en Autriche-Hongrie, M. Abafi,¹⁴ ce Fekete ne pouvait guère être l'ancien vice-chancelier de Hongrie, le père du nôtre. Et l'on sait d'autre part que Fekete János était en 1784 à Trieste et dans la région. Il y est revenu plus tard; mêlé à la conjuration de Hompesch il avait jugé bon de s'éloigner quelque peu des capitales. C'est à Trieste qu'il apprit la mort de Joseph II (1790). Ne serait-ce pas là aussi qu'il connut cette traduction de Gibbon par Fabroni, à l'endroit de laquelle le clergé d'Italie agissait avec tant d' "imprudence"?

IV

Le texte que nous avons reproduit mentionne la mort de Léopold II. Il daterait donc au plus tôt de 1792, puisque ce prince,

¹³ Marczali Henrik, *Az 1790-91-dik országgyűlés*, II, 249 et suiv.

¹⁴ Abafi, *Geschichte der Freimaurerei in Oesterreich-Ungarn* (Bud. 1890-99), IV, 375.—Morvay Győző, dans *Irodalom Történeti Közlemények*, 1901, p. 51.

grand-duc de Toscane dès sa dix-huitième année et durant vingt-cinq ans (1765-1790) mourut deux ans après avoir remplacé son frère Joseph II sur le trône impérial. "Trop tôt pour le bonheur du monde," dit ici Fekete. Ailleurs, en termes moins enthousiastes, il écrit de lui: "s'il n'a pas fait les grandes choses qu'on espérait de lui, au moins n'a-t-il rien gâté."¹⁵

Il semble ne faire état ici que de quelques chapitres de Gibbon, surtout des XXIIe et XXIIIe, où il est question de la religion de Julien, de son fanatisme, de sa dissimulation en matière de foi, de son initiation aux mystères éleusiniens à Ephèse, de son enthousiasme et de ses jeûnes, de ses dix années de ruse jusqu'au début de la guerre civile, où il se déclara tout à coup l'implacable ennemi du christianisme. En quoi Gibbon ne faisait guère que rappeler à Fekete Voltaire encore: Julien n'est-il pas, selon M. Ernest Dupuy, l'un des saints laïques les plus honorés au *Dictionnaire Philosophique*?¹⁶

Mais dans un passage antérieur du même recueil manuscrit il était déjà question de Gibbon, à peu près du même ton (no. XCIII):

"On s'acharne, à nouveaux frais, à décrier la sainte Philosophie, cette sœur jumelle de la Religion, et l'on ne réfléchit pas que, malgré tout ce que l'on nous dit des horreurs de la dépravation de ce siècle, auquel on fait l'honneur de l'appeler Philosophique, le monde valait encore moins lorsqu'il était ignorant; dans ces temps barbares qui ont suivi la destruction de l'Empire Romain, il s'est commis mille et mille fois plus de crimes, le sang humain a coulé avec bien plus d'abondance, que dans telle autre époque, d'une culture plus ou moins avancée: on n'a qu'à lire Gibbon pour s'en convaincre."

Et il continuait (no. XCIV): "Il n'y a que ceux qui y gagnent, qui voudraient maintenir ou rejeter les peuples dans l'ignorance; enfants des ténèbres, ils craignent la lumière, bien persuadés de ne pouvoir pêcher qu'en eau trouble. Mais leurs efforts seront vains, les étincelles de lumière répandues sur la surface du globe que nous habitons ont pris de trop fortes racines, une certaine lueur de clarté s'est si visiblement étendue sur les deux mondes, que je

¹⁵ Fekete János, *Œuvres Posthumes inédites, Petites Réflexions*, no. XL.

¹⁶ Ernest Dupuy, A. de Vigny, *L'Homme et l'Œuvre*, p. 169.

crois à peine le Kamschadale aussi abruti que l'était l'Europe il y a deux siècles . . ." Un autre ouvrage de lui parlait déjà de "l'usage digne des Kamschadales" qui préside aux mariages des jeunes filles nobles de Vienne.¹⁷

Si la langue semble ici moins sûre, la foi en des "étincelles de lumière" qui auraient pris racine au travers des deux mondes n'est pas moins confiante, ni, en somme, moins généreuse. Gibbon sert décidément d'appoint à la lutte contre l'obscurantisme. Fekete n'écrivait-il pas de même à son fils, avant de lui parler d'Helvétius :

"Vous savez que les étincelles que votre esprit a jetées de temps en temps, en me pénétrant de joie, n'ont servi qu'à fortifier en moi le désir de vous associer aux travaux sacrés de la saine Philosophie, qui, répandue sur l'univers entier, forme une association tacite pour le progrès de la lumière" ?¹⁸

Un autre passage oppose à la vraie religion chrétienne selon Jésus, "si pure, si simple, et par là si céleste," les communions actuelles "qui se combattent sans s'entendre" (no. CVIII) :

"A peine mourut-il, qu'on vit le Platonisme de l'école d'Alexandrie, déjà si dégénéré lui-même, infecter ses dogmes et fournir matière à ces disputes interminables qui occupèrent la fainéantise oiseuse des moines d'Orient; ces pieux solitaires se lassèrent bientôt de ne travailler qu'à des métiers utiles, ils s'occupèrent de ce qu'ils n'entendaient pas plus que nous, et tout en voulant éclaircir des mystères inconcevables, cimentèrent le germe d'un tas d'hérésies, aussi ridicules les unes que les autres, et souvent très dangereuses par l'influence qu'elles eurent sur le système politique des empires. Quand Mahomet II prit Constantinople, cette Capitale disputait Théologie, au lieu de ce battre sur les remparts."

Or Gibbon a conté, au chapitre LXVIII de son *Decline and Fall*, le siège de Constantinople en 1453 par les 20.000 hommes de Mahomet II, sa défense héroïque, du 5 avril au 29 mai, par l'empereur Constantin Dragascès avec une garnison moindre de moitié, l'assaut général, les Turcs, repoussés partout, reussissant à surprendre une porte, Constantin trouvé mort sous un monceau de cadavres, et le carnage de la population civile qui, au lieu de contribuer à la défense, attendait avec confiance l'arrivée d'un ange protecteur. . . .

¹⁷ Fekete János, *Esquisse d'un Tableau Mouvant de Vienne*, p. 55.

¹⁸ Id., *Œuvres Posthumes*, inédites, A mon Fils, p. 39.

D'autre part, des lettres de Fekete János à son ami l'écrivain Aranka, transcrites au recueil de ses *Œuvres magyares* inédites, nomment plus d'une fois Gibbon, citent même ses *Mémoires*, relèvent qu'il a, comme Tacite, l'accent de la justice. Ses *Petites Réflexions*, on l'a vu, l'appelaient un "émule de Tacite." Fekete fils avait entrepris de traduire Gibbon. Quant au père, il ne parle de rien moins que de retracer à la manière de Gibbon la plus grande infortune de l'histoire hongroise, le désastre de Mohács.¹⁹

L'admiration, la foi commune, ont seules de ces audaces. De ce hardi projet nous n'avons qu'une ébauche.²⁰ Et peut-être cela vaut-il mieux. Le cas de Fekete János disciple tardif de Gibbon peut cependant servir de preuve que d'une littérature à une autre, les influences ne perdent rien de leur force à être accidentelles parfois et souvent indirectes.

HENRI TRONCHON.

Université de Strasbourg.

ON ALLEGORY IN *THE TEMPEST*

An interesting case of how the allegorizers of Shakspeare refuse to give him credit for common sense and an elementary knowledge of practical play-writing occurs, I think, in Mr. Colin Still's recent Shakespeare's Mystery Play (1921). In the course of a lengthy comparison of the details of *The Tempest* with the ancient "mystery" or initiation, he pronounces it remarkable that the costumes of Gonzalo and other members of the court are not soiled by the water into which they are cast by Prospero's magic. "In view of this explicit statement," writes Mr. Still (p. 18), "that these men plunged into the water, an especial importance must attach to the fact that Gonzalo, after landing upon the Island, calls atten-

¹⁹ Id., *Magyar Munkái* inédites, II, 99, 159, 147, 92.

²⁰ Ce fragment historique de *Magyarok Története* (aux *Magyar Munkái* inédites, II, 131, cf. 141) devait être l'histoire de la Hongrie jusqu'à Mohács. La dissolution de la Société Transylvaine Hongroise, *Erdélyi Magyar Nyelvmívelő Társaság*, empêcha l'impression et déjà l'achèvement de l'œuvre historique de Fekete. Voir à ce sujet Morvay G., *Galántai Gróf Fekete János*, p. 202-205, et Krasso Jolán, *Galántai Gróf Fekete János Magyar Munkái*, p. 32.

tion no less than four times to the unblemished condition of his clothes. The Poet seems to be emphasizing some highly significant circumstance." "The fact is," continues Mr. Still (p. 19), "the immersion in the water is not understood in a strictly physical sense. Like baptism in the Christian Church and the 'washings' in the pagan rites, it is represented as a physical occurrence; but its significance is entirely subjective."

That Shakspeare should follow the remark of Ariel (I, ii, 218-9) that the garments of the nobles are unimpaired by the sea water with Gonzalo's fourfold insistence (II, i, 61-4; 68-70; 96-8; 102-3) that they show no signs of a ducking certainly indicates in no uncertain manner that the dramatist is "emphasizing some highly significant circumstance." This is especially so in view of the fact that in the same play the mariners enter wet (I, i, 52) and Caliban, Stephano and Trinculo enter "all wet" (IV, i). Instead of finding subtle symbolism in the occurrence, however, let us see if Shakspeare's curious insistence that the salt water freshened rather than soiled the garments of his nobles can not be more plausibly explained on grounds entirely compatible with practical play-writing. In other words, is not the dramatist resorting to this repetition of an apparently minor detail in order to protect himself against the ridicule which may well have originated in a critical audience in consequence of the absurd situation resulting from the presence in *The Tempest* of two conflicting conventions of the Elizabethan theater—the drenching of actors for the purpose of stage realism and the costuming of noble characters in costly and delicate garments not only to satisfy the vanity of individual players but for the purposes of stage decoration and the protection to actors forced to perform in closest proximity to richly bedecked gallants? A Mr. Bartley is reported to have been fond of saying to Planché: "Sir, you must tell them you are going to do so and so, you must then tell them you are doing it, then that you have done it; and then, perhaps, they will understand you." The same compliment to an audience has been attributed to a contemporary dramatist, while Henry Ward Beecher and an eminent American scholar have been credited with a very similar comment regarding visitors to sermons and readers of articles in the so-called learned journals; and whereas Shakspeare has nowhere expressed himself in such language, it is

reasonable to suppose that he understood the vital necessity of absolute clearness in certain dramatic details and consequently in *The Tempest* has taken pains to clarify—and by so doing artistically justify—an obvious absurdity at the risk of being somewhat repetitious.

Now for evidence illustrating the stage conventions referred to above. The practice of drenching actors for realistic effect can be abundantly illustrated. Low or comic characters were frequently subjected to a species of wetting more disagreeable than that administered to Trinculo and his fellows in *The Tempest* or the Horsecourser in *Dr. Faustus*. In *Blurt, Master Constable* (iv, i), for instance, Curvetto pulls a cord hanging from a window and is "drenched with water"; the lecherous courtier in Nabbes's *Tottingham-Court* (III, v), while hiding in a tub, is drenched by a maid servant with a "paille of conduit water"; more realistic than anything in the movies is the emptying of the "chamber-pot" on Crackstone's head in *The Two Italian Gentlemen* (I. 1422); and in Jordan's *Tricks of Youth* Sir Reference inflicts an even greater indignity upon the drunken Pimpwell (iv, ii). Not only were the garments of lowly characters dampened for the amusement of the audience, but leading characters in serious plays frequently appeared in a similar condition. At the beginning of II, i of Heywood's *Captives*, to illustrate, Palaestra enters "all wett as newly shipwrecke"; Pericles appears "wet" (II, i); while in the dumb show near the beginning of Heywood's *Four Prentices of London* Godfrey appears "as newly landed and halfe naked," Grey comes in "all wet," and Charles enters "all wet with his sword." It is apparently to such realism that Jasper Mayne refers in his poem on Ben Jonson:

Thine were land-tragedies, no prince was found
To swim a whole scene out, then o' the stage drowned.

That Shakspeare in a play which was certainly not a "land-tragedy" should have done a deal of explaining why the garments of his nobles were not water-soaked when stage realism demanded that they be so provided is pretty obvious. The play demanded that Ferdinand and his fellows be garbed in showy and expensive clothes; and since there was neither time nor opportunity for a convincing change of costume, the dramatist did not see fit to

subject expensive garments to a wetting or give to his noble personages a bedraggled aspect. Indeed, there is an especial reason why this particular play should have demanded costumes whose original "freshness and glosses" had been "newdyes" by magic waters. In its present form the play contains abundant evidence of having been acted at court; and at court realism in costume was frankly sacrificed for richness and beauty. Perhaps the most striking indication of this court convention is found in the speech of the Boy which precedes the prologue of Hausted's *Rivall Friends*, acted at Cambridge on March 19, 1631:

"Yee must suppose the Scene too to be here in England at a country village. Some low homely slight stuffe 'twill be, I doubt . . . And here's an other dainty absurdity too (which I care not much if I tell yee) concerning their cloathes, which as far transcend the condition of the persons, as the court does the country. But that they hope the Court will excuse, for had it not bin here, they had bin forc'd (they say) to keepe the true *decorum*."

Anyone who may be interested in other instances where "decorum" was similarly sacrificed at court will find an abundance of material in Feuillerat's *Documents of the Revels*, Reyher's *Les Masques Anglais*, and Simpson and Bell's *Designs by Inigo Jones for Masques and Plays at Court*.

THORNTON S. GRAVES.

University of North Carolina.

OLD SAXON NOTES

1) *ÊNHARD*

Uuarð thar êosago

an morgantfd manag gisamnod
irri endi ênhard inuuideas gern,
uureðes uuillean.

(*Héliand* 5060)

What does the adjective *ênhard* mean here? Behagel in his edition of the *Héliand* (1910) gives it as "sehr hart, sehr böse"; whereas Piper in his edition (1897) in a foot-note gives it as "fest auf sich selbst stehend, entschlossen, mutig."

In the first place, the adjective *-hard*, as the context shows, is here used in a pejorative sense, i. e., not 'brave,' 'determined [to do something praiseworthy]' but 'hard,' 'evil,' as in [*gêl*]-*hert* 'insolent' or [*gram*]-*hard* 'hostile.' Piper's 'entschlossen,' 'mutig' is, therefore, entirely misleading.

In the second place, the word *ên-* in OS., as the first element of a compound, is usually confined to one of two senses, viz., either 'one,' 'alone,' as in *ên-fald* 'one-fold' > 'unmixed,' 'true,' etc., *ên-koro* 'alone,' 'lonely,' *ên-ôdi* 'solitude,' 'desert,' etc. or 'at one,' 'together,' as in *ên-wald* 'of one power,' 'agreed,' 'in harmony,' *ên-wordi* 'one in word,' 'agreed.'

I believe that *ên-* in the adjective *ên-hard* either has the intensive force of 'altogether,' i. e., 'altogether, entirely evil, hard' (= Behagel's 'sehr hart,' 'sehr böse') or denotes the idea of 'at one,' 'agreed,' i. e., 'agreed upon doing evil.' The context gives us no clue in this regard; the scribes were thoroly *wicked* and at the same time *agreed* in their determination to do evil to Jesus, i. e., to destroy him.

But there is apparently a third sense of *ên-* in OS., viz., 'one's self,' 'self,' which occurs in the adjective *ên-strîdig* 'stubborn,' 'eigensinnig,' lit. 'striving for one's self,' 'striving to have one's own way.' This sense of **ain-*, as the first element of a compound, is especially frequent in ON.; with OS. *ên-strîdig* 'stubborn' compare ON. *ein-ráðr* 'stubborn' 'self-willed,' lit. 'controlling for one's self,' and ON. *ein-vili* 'self-willed,' lit. 'wanting for one's self.' In all these cases *ein-* has reference to the person in question; hence the idea of 'self.'

Possibly it is this sense of *ên-* in OS. which Piper had in mind when he rendered the adjective *ên-hard* by 'fest auf sich selbst stehend.' But the pejorative sense of the adjective in our passage would exclude this meaning, i. e., 'self-reliant,' 'firm,' which denotes a good quality. This meaning belongs to ON. *ein-arðr* (**ein-harðr*) 'firm,' 'steadfast' rather than to OS. *ên-hard*.

In conclusion it is interesting to note that the word *ên-* in OS. is never prefixed to an adjective having a laudatory or a good sense. In this case the intensive prefix is always *ala-*: *alo-* 'all'; cf. *ala-hwît* 'all white,' *ala-jung* 'very young,' *alo-hêl* 'all whole,' 'sound,' *alo-mahtig* 'almighty,' etc., but *ên-hard* 'only evil,' 'entirely evil.'

2) *FELGIAN* 'To Cover With Something,' 'Heap Upon'

OS. *felgian*: OHG. *felgen* < **falg-jan*, but with what root is this stem **falg-* connected? I take the stem **falg-* to be the *Hochstufe* of the 3rd. ablaut series represented by the strong verb OS. *felhan*, *falh*: *fulhum*, -*folhan* 'to bury.' WGerm. **falg-jan* meant then 'to cause to be buried,' from which the senses both of the OS. verb *felgian* 'to cover [with something]' and of the OHG. verb *felgen* 1) 'impute to' (*beilegen*); 2) 'arrogate to one's self,' 'claim' (*für sich etwas beanspruchen*) may readily be derived.

The OS. verb preserves the primary sense of the verb **falg-jan*, i. e., 'to cause to be buried' > 'to cover'; from this sense of 'to cover' we have in OHG. first the sense of 'put upon,' 'attach to' and then finally from the sense of 'attach to' is developed the sense of 'impute,' 'lay claim to'; what has been 'attached to' one may be 'claimed' as belonging to one. For a similar semantic development 'bury,' 'hide,' 'cover' > 'attach to,' 'give to' compare Gothic [*ga*]-*filhan* 'hide,' 'bury': *ana-filhan* 'give over' 'entrust,' OS.-OHG. *bi-felhan* 'hide,' 'bury' > 'give over to,' 'entrust.'

The root **falg-*,¹ so far as I know, has not heretofore been connected with the verb *felhan*; it is not listed by Fick (*Vgl. Wörterb. der indogerm. Sprachen*⁴, p. 237) under the root *felh-*, *falh-*, *fulg-*, etc. But I think it is clear that both the form and the meaning of OS. *felgian* support my etymology, and OHG. *felgen* can hardly be separated from OS. *felgian*.

3) *MANGON* 'To Do Business,' 'Traffic'

OS. *mang-on* 'to traffic,' 'do business': OE. [*ge*]-*mang-ian* 'to gain by traffic' < **mang-ôn*. The primary sense of this stem **mang-*² is 'mix'; cf. OS. *gi-mang*: OE. *ge-mang* 'mixing,'

¹ The root **felh-* 'bury,' 'hide,' I believe also appears in the ON. adjective *ffálgr* 'safe,' 'well kept'; i. e., **felg-o-s* with accent in the Indo-European on the end syllable > **felg-a-n* > *ffálgr* with later lengthening of the vowel *a* before *l* + a consonant *ffálgr*; but this word is not listed by Fick under *felh-*, p. 237. The idea of 'safe,' 'well kept' may easily be derived from the primary sense of 'to hide,' cf. Germ. *wohl geborgen*, 'safe and sound,' *bergen* 'to hide.'

² For the root **mang-* see Fick, *Vgl. Wörterb. der indogerm. Sprachen*⁴, sub (*meng*) 2., *mangian*, p. 309.

'crowd [of people]'; **mang-jan* > OS. *mengian*, MHG.-NHG. *mengen* 'to mix.'

In OE. the substantive *ge-mang* is already found in the sense of 'business,' 'traffic.' The semantic development is 'mixing,' 'crowd of people' > 'business, traffic in a place (i. e., the market) where people congregate': hence the denominative verbs OE. *ge-mangian* 'to gain by traffic': OS. *mangon* 'to traffic,' 'do business.'

An interesting semantic parallel to the denominative verbs OE. *ge-mangian*: OS. *mangon* (from a substantive stem **mang-ô*, cf. *ge-mang* 'a crowd of people') is offered by Greek *ἀγορά*: *ἀγοράζειν*. The substantive *ἀγορά* is derived from the stem *ἀγ-* (as in *ἀγ-ειν*) 'drive together,' 'assemble'; *ἀγορά* = 'meeting place,' 'public forum' > 'market place' > 'market,' cf. *ἀγορὰν παρέχειν* 'to hold a market'; from this latter sense of *ἀγορά* (= 'market') we have the denominative verb *ἀγορά-ζειν* 'to traffic,' 'do business.'

4) Regarding the Instrumental Genitive

The genitive case is often used in the *Heliand* with an instrumental function; thus 2622M *biliðeo sagða* "He told *by means of* parables," 5943 *he iru selbo gibôð torohtero tēcno* "He himself commanded her *by bright signs*." Sometimes such a genitive is used parallel with the instrumental case; cf. 2719,

*andrêd that he thene uueroldcuning
sprâcono gespôni endi spâhun uuordun*

"She feared that he would urge the king *by speeches* and *by wise words*."

This use of the genitive case is only one phase of that category which Holthausen (*As. Grm.*², § 487, 1, 2) designates as "ein freierer Genitiv"³ (i. e., a looser use of the genitive). The genitive case here denotes an adverbial usage, i. e., *in what way*, from which was developed the specific function of instrumentality, i. e., *by what means*.

This looser (adverbial) use of the genitive occurs quite frequently in ON. (cf. Nygaard, *Norrøn Syntax*, 1905, § 142, "Enkeltstaaende anvendelser"). As an interesting parallel in ON. to this *instru-*

³ Cf. also Behagel, *Syntax des Heliand*, p. 171, § 271.

mental function of the adverbial genitive I may refer to the phrase, often occurring in the *Elder Edda*,⁴ *þegi þú þeira orða* (*þrymskv.*, 17, *Guðrúnkv.*, I, 23, etc.) "Be silent with those words"; cf. this phrase with the OS. *biliðeo sagða* (*Héliand* 2622M) "He told in (i. e., with) parables."

5) *HE NIATE OF HE MÔTI*

Uuita kiasan im ôðrana

niudsamna namon: *he niate of he môti*
(*Héliand* 224)

What is the significance of this expression *he niate of he môti*? Piper in his edition of the *Héliand* (1897) translates it by "Er geniesse (ihn, den Namen), wenn er in der Lage (dazu) ist." I should rather translate: "Er geniesse ihn, wenn *es ihm beschieden ist*," "Let him enjoy it, if he may (i. e., if this privilege be granted him by Fate)." Piper's rendering "wenn er in der Lage dazu ist," "if he is in a position to," "if he can," seems to me to be out of keeping with the situation involved. What does the phrase "in der Lage dazu" really mean in this connection?

To my mind the passage can convey sense only when we regard the phrase *he niate of he môti* as an old epic formula. The verb *môti* denotes a hypothetical future idea; i. e., "if he may," "if it be his lot." The future was, according to the Old Germanic religion, in the hands of Fate, and I believe that our passage contains this idea as regards the ceremony of name-giving.

We know from the *Helgakviða* I of the ON. *Poetic Edda* that the Norns directed the whole course of the child's life at birth. Now, our passage is wholly original on the part of the poet; there is nothing corresponding to it in *Tatian* IV, 11 (Luke, 1, 61). This fact proves clearly enough that the phrase *he niate of he môti* represents a purely Germanic conception. It is reasonable to assume that the ceremony of name-giving to the child was connected with the notion of Fate, i. e., that the child's name was supposed to be included in his future success or happiness, all of which was determined at its birth. The phrase *he niate of he môti* evidently means then: "Let him enjoy (i. e., have good from) his name, if Fate so decrees."

⁴ The numbering of the ON. reference to the *Elder Edda* is based upon the Hildebrand-Gering edition⁴, 1922.

In support of the assumption that this phrase is an Old Germanic epic formula I need only to refer to the *Hildebrandslied* 60, where Hiltibrant says: *niuse dê môtiti* "Let him enjoy [the victory], who may (*i. e.*, to whom Fate may give the victory)."

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT.

University of Kansas.

NOTE ON KING LEAR

Men must endure

Their going hence, even as their coming hither;
Ripeness is all. (v. 2, 9-11)

Read apart from their context these lines seem to admit of but one interpretation; indeed their meaning seems so obvious that the commentators, finding no ground for discussion, have passed them by almost without notice. Their apparent purpose would seem to preach resignation to "the inevitable end"; to reiterate the old, if rather obvious, truth, that even as we submit to birth (having, indeed, no choice in the matter), so we must submit to death likewise, when the full time shall come. Furness quotes Stevens,—who bids us compare *Hamlet*, v. 2, 210, "the readiness is all,"—and Wordsworth, who takes "readiness" and "ripeness" in the sense of spiritually fit to die.¹ Furness also refers to Birch, who sees in "ripeness" "nothing but materialism": a likening of "man to fruit which must fall."² But, in spite of minor differences, all seem to accept the most obvious meaning of the passage without question, and there is a general disposition, shared by the late Professor R. M. Alden, to assume that the passages in *Lear* and *Hamlet* are expressions of the same thought. Indeed, in quoting the two passages Professor Alden italicizes "ripeness is all" and "the readiness is all,"³ to emphasize the closeness of the parallel between the two nearly identical phrases.

The odds seem greatly in favor of this natural interpretation, supported as it seems to be by such a weight of authority, and yet

¹ *On Shakespeare's Knowledge and Use of the Bible*, pp. 245-6.

² *An Inquiry into the Philosophy and Religion of Shakespeare*, pp. 424-5.

³ Alden's *Shakespeare*, pp. 338-9.

I have long been troubled with doubts as to its correctness. I cannot but feel, moreover, that the implied similarity between the associated passages is largely verbal and superficial, and that we are insensibly led by their conjunction to miss the real significance of the passage in *Lear*. On the other hand there may be difficulties in the way of our adopting another interpretation which seems, from one aspect, distinctly preferable. Under the circumstances, it seems better to submit the case to the judgment of the Court.

My difficulty is that if we take the words in their ordinary and natural sense, we render them utterly inappropriate to the situation which calls them forth. It will be remembered that they are spoken by Edgar to Gloster, after the rout of the King's forces by Edmund. In the early part of the scene, Edgar has left the helpless Gloster in a place of comparative safety near the battlefield, promising to return if he survives the fight. Edgar rushes back to his father and tells him that all is lost. Gloster knows that he can end his life simply by remaining, and he chooses to remain and die. He answers Edgar's hurried words, "give me thy hand, come on," with a flat refusal:

No further, sir; a man may rot even here.

The situation in a former scene is thus strikingly repeated. Once before Gloster has tried to end his life and has been saved from self-destruction by Edgar. And in the past Edgar has done more than save his father from death, he has been instrumental in changing Gloster's whole attitude toward suicide. When Gloster throws himself, as he imagines, from the cliff, he is at first bitterly rebellious when he finds that he still lives:—

Is wretchedness depriv'd that benefit,
To end itself by death? 'Twas yet some comfort,
When misery could beguile the tyrant's rage,
And frustrate his proud will. (iv. 6, 61)

But Edgar persuades him that the gods have miraculously preserved him, and Gloster comes to believe that his life is not his to fling away at pleasure when the burden grows too heavy, but a gift of the gods to be accepted and endured until they themselves shall give the signal for release. He accordingly tells Edgar:

henceforth I'll bear (i. e. endure)
 Affliction, till it do cry out itself
 Enough, enough, and die. (iv. 6, 75)

A little later he shows even more clearly that he has learned the lesson of endurance which Edgar has helped to teach him:

You ever gentle gods, take my breath from me;
 Let not my worser spirit tempt me again
 To die before you please! (iv. 6, 214)

In the scene we are considering Gloster's "worser spirit" *does* return to tempt him and to triumph over his good resolutions. Once more, forgetful of the past, he yields to the temptation to die by his own act. Hence Edgar first stirs his recollection of all that has gone before with the reminder—"What, in ill thoughts *again?*" and then goes on to combat those "ill thoughts" in the passage under discussion. Now it is surely incredible that Edgar should choose this breathless and critical moment to assure his father that all men must die. His object is to save him; he is not telling him that he must "endure" death, but that, longing to die, he must be patient to endure life. It seems evident that Gloster himself understands Edgar's words in this sense, for he abandons his idea of inviting death by remaining. He admits the truth of Edgar's words (v. 2, 11) and then accepts the chances of prolonging his life and suffers himself to be led away.

This then is certainly what the passage should mean, read in the light of its context, but will the words themselves admit of such an interpretation?

The matter turns first upon the meaning we attach to the word "endure," and secondarily upon the emphasis we lay on the phrase "even as" and the significance we give to "ripeness." Endure may be taken in two ways. If we were justified in supposing that some such word as "unto" or "until" was to be understood after "endure," we should get the meaning which all that has gone before has led us to expect:—men must patiently endure unto death even as they wait for birth. But I can find no entirely satisfactory precedent for such a use of "endure," and I am not competent to say whether it is allowable.

If however, we reject this construction of "endure" we may get the same meaning from the passage and yet take "endure" in

the more usual sense. Edgar may mean that we must endure (*i. e.* bear, or submit to) death precisely as we endure birth, *if we are to obey the moral law*. The compulsion, that is, is not actual but moral, for in the world of fact the analogy between our "going hence" and our "coming hither" is not perfect. Man cannot choose when his life shall begin, he has the power to end it before the gods or Nature shall decree. Thus, while he can defeat the will of the gods by anticipating the hour of his "going hence," he should, according to the moral law, submit to death *precisely* as he has unconsciously submitted to birth; that is, he should wait in patience for the appointed time because in both cases "ripeness is (*i. e.* ought to be) all."

This interpretation does more than harmonize with the immediate context, it brings us nearer to one of the great motifs of the play. In the other great tragedies of Shakespeare our sympathies go out to individual sufferers, but in *Lear*, more than in all other plays, we are moved and purified by the sense that life itself is tragic. We must accept this mysterious burden of life, this weight of misery that is laid upon us, and we must bear it, "endure" it, until the gods shall give us leave to lay it down. Gloster must learn the lesson that Lear has learned in a rough school, and it is Lear himself who teaches it to Gloster:

If thou wilt weep my fortune, take my eyes.
I know thee well enough; thy name is Gloster;
Thou must be patient; we came crying hither.
Thou know'st, the first time that we smell the air,
We waul, and cry:—I will preach to thee:—mark.

(IV. 6, 172)

There is, consequently, a slight distinction between the associated passages in *Lear* and *Hamlet*, a difference in emphasis, perhaps, rather than a difference in meaning, which, elusive as it is, is full of significance. The situation in the two plays is distinctly dissimilar. When he spoke the words in question, Hamlet was not contemplating suicide; he was rather disquieted by a presentiment of his approaching death. But, he adds, all that matters is, that a man shall be ready to die when his time comes. By "ready" I suppose Hamlet means here, not fit, or spiritually prepared, as Wordsworth holds, but rather willing. He is thinking, as I understand it, of a conscious acquiescence in the will of that Provi-

dence whose care for man has just been in his mind. "Ripeness" on the other hand, implies no conscious, intelligent act of will. It comes of itself with fulness of growth; it is that maturity given by nature rather than anything that is brought about by man's conscious effort. In the one case, therefore, emphasis is laid on the thought that a man should hold himself ready to die; in the other, on the fact that tragic as life may be, a man should wait patiently until the great forces that rule over life bring his days to an end. Thus understood, Edgar's speech becomes an answer to Gloster's bitter arraignment, "May not the wretched even die when life becomes intolerable?" And Edgar's answer, "No, men must endure," is in the spirit of those words, wonderfully pathetic in the mouth of the tempestuous and choleric Lear, "Thou must be patient."

HENRY S. PANCOAST.

Chestnut Hill, Pa.

TWO LEXICOGRAPHICAL NOTES

I

Büsten and beten

The alliterative phrase *büsten and beten* is first found in two early 13th-century documents written in the Southern dialect, *Hali Meidenhad* and the *Liflade of Saint Juliana*. In *Hali Meidenhad* (rev. ed. F. J. Furnivall, *EETS*, No. 18, 1922, p. 42/455 and p. 43/463) it is pointed out in favor of maidenhood that a husband "*beateð & busteð þe as his iþohte þrel*" "beats and thrashes (Gloss. ed. cit. p. 78, "mauleth, beateth") thee like his bought thrall." *Juliana* (ed. O. Cockayne, *EETS*, No. 51, 1872, p. 24) says she will hold to her faith "*þah þu me buste and beate*" "though thou thrash (Gloss. ed. cit. p. 89, *buste, baste?*) and beat me."

In the so-called "second" version of the ME. Saint Alexius legend, MS. Laud 463 (ed. F. J. Furnivall, *EETS*, No. 69, p. 53). The passage reads:

Ofte þei [the servants] him *bete and buste*
 þat þe lord [Eufemian] þer of niste,
 þese wikkede fode. (vv. 331 ff.)

Here the rhyme shows *buste* = *büste*: *niste* = *nüste* < O. E. *nyste*

(cp. Schipper's reading *infra*). According to Dr. Horstmann (Herrig's *Archiv*, LVI, 401) the Laud MS. (Horstmann's Laud L. 70 is now Laud 463) is later and in most cases not so good as MS. Trin. Coll. Oxf. 57. The reading of the corresponding passage in the Trin. Coll. MS. (printed parallel by Horstmann and in *EETS*, ed. cit. *supra*) is as follows:

Ofte hy him *bete* and *burste*
 þat þe lord þer of *nuste*,
 þo vnlede fode. (vv. 331 ff.)

It will be noted at once that the Trin. Coll. MS. has the impossible rhyme *burste:nüste* for *büste:niste* of Laud. In the above-mentioned article Dr. Horstman points out (with examples, p. 401) that both MSS. are from an original in the Southern dialect and that the Trin. Coll. MS., though the older and in general the better, may in many instances be corrected by the readings in Laud. These verses (*Alexius*, 331 ff.) are not included among the instances which he cites to this effect. The existence of the formula as attested in *Hali Meidenhad* and the *Liflade of Saint Juliana*, together with the false rhyme in the Trin. Coll. MS., points conclusively to the superiority of the Laud reading for this line. It may be noted that this is the reading (*buste:nuste*) adopted by Schipper in his critical edition of the text (*Sitz. Ber. Wien. Akad.*, phil-histor. kl., CXIV, 1887, p. 281). Schipper's note to this line (art. cit. p. 301, note to line 331) is very much to the point:

Die Lesart *burste* (statt *busten* = schlagen) in T[rin Coll. MS.] ist sinnlos und könnte durch Verhören entstanden sein.

I should lay the "Verhören" of the Trin. Coll. scribe to ignorance of the idiom, which seems to be local—Southern—and to a confusion of *büsten* with *busten*, the popular dialectal pronunciation of *bursten* (*bersten*).

The scribe of the copy of *The Owl and the Nightingale* preserved in MS. Jesus College Oxf. 29 had evidently fallen into the same error and presumably for the same reasons. He gives v. 1610 as follows:

& me to-burste[þ] & to-bete[þ].

The same line in MS. Cotton Caligula A ix runs:

an me to-bustep & to-betep

Here we have *to-büsten* and *to-beten* instead of *büsten* and *beten*, but the idiom is evidently the same.

In his edition of *O. and N.* (Boston, 1907) J. E. Wells glosses *to-buste* "breaks, rends," (p. 241²), an interpretation apparently based on an identification of *to-busten* with *to-bursten*. The most recent editor, J. W. H. Atkins (Cambridge, 1922) goes so far as to amend the Cotton MS. reading to *to-bu[r]step* and in his Glossary gives only **to-bersten* "break," evidently rejecting *to-busten* entirely.

From the foregoing examples there can be no doubt that the reading *to-buste* of the Cotton MS., older and in general better (cp. Atkins' ed., p. xxviii, β, where *to-burste* for *to-buste* should be added to the list of J's erroneous substitutions), is right and that the line should be translated "and thrashes me and beats me badly (*to-*)."

The etymology of *me. büsten*.

From the rhyme *buste: niste* (Schipper, *buste: nüste*) in the *Laud Alexius*, the *-u-* in *buste* is evidently for the sound *ü* and is so taken in Bradley-Stratmann's *Middle-English Dictionary*, sub *büsten*, "v. ? beat, bruise." No OE. *bystan* > ME. *büsten* is recorded, but there are verbs in the related languages which make clear the origin and original meaning of the ME. verb.

There occurs in OIcel. *beysta* "to beat" < **baustjan*. In Swedish dialect we have *bystä* < **bustjan*, in the phrase *bystä till någon* "to strike, knock against someone" (J. E. Rietz, *Svenskt Dialekt-Lexikon*, 1867; apparently not *bysta* "to hackel, comb, cavil at" as cited by NED, sub *bust*, v¹). The ablaut-relationship of *beysta: bystä* is *Hochstufe: Schwundstufe*, the ablaut-grade which appears in the Latin cognate *fustis* "cudgel, club" (A. Walde, *Etymol. Latein. Wtb.*, 2. Aufl., 1910, s. v.). It is unlikely that the Swedish dialect *bystä*, or the OIcel. *beysta* (>ME. **beisten*), lies directly behind ME. *büsten*, but we may accept as the etymon an OE. **bystan* (< **bustjan*) "to strike," standing in clear relationship to verbal roots represented in the North Germanic languages. (For further examples and wider relations of this root, cp. Verwijs and Verdam, *Middelnederl. Woordenboek*, 1885, sub *buust* (*buyst*) "cudgel," and E. Hellqvist, *Svensk Etymol. Ordbok*, Lund 1920-, sub *bösta*).

II

Lóf and grín

The present note proposes a solution of the phrase *lof ȝ grín* in the following disputed passage in the Peterborough Chronicle, A. D. 1137:

"In mani of ðe castles wæron lof ȝ grī. ð wæron rachenteges ð twa oðer thre men hadden onoh to bæron onne (Earle and Plummer, I, 264)."

In and for itself and abbreviation *grī* may stand either for *grim*, adj., or *grin*, sb., "a snare" or "hangman's noose" (cf. NED. and Toller's Supplement to Bosworth's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* s. v. III). No interpretation has been offered for *lof*. (*Lof*, n. = Germ. *Lob* would not fit the context and has never been proposed for the present passage). Interpretations of the passage have varied according to the interpretation given *grī*. Editors who expand *grī* to *grim*, adj., have regarded *lof* as a misspelling for *lōð* (OE. *lād*, adj.) and translate the phrase "things loathly and grim." Editors who expand *grī* to *grin*, subst., leave *lof* untranslated, regarding it as the name for an unknown instrument of torment parallel to *grin*. Morris (*Specimens of Early M. E.*, pp. 294-295) proposed an emendation of *lof* to *loc* "bolt, bar, beam," but this has not found favor among later editors.

It seems fairly certain that *lof* and *grī*, to whichever part of speech they belong, are parallel in construction: if one is an adjective, so is the other; if one is a substantive, the other is a substantive also. In favor of their being substantives is the plural verb *wæron*; against this view is the fact that nothing is known of *lof*, sb., which could here be parallel to *grin*. Hence arises the temptation to take *grī* for *grim* and emend *lof* to *lōð*.

Durior lectio preferenda est. Besides *lof* (Germ. *Lob*), there is an OE. *lóf*, a rare word (its use here in the Peterborough Chronicle appears to be the only occurrence in post-Conquest English,) found in OE. only in an 11th century gloss to Aldhelm's *de Laudibus Virginitatis* (cf. Giles' ed. p. 76, line 6): redimicula (Aeneid IX, 616), wrædas, cynewiððan, lófas (A. S. Napier, *OE. Glosses*, Oxf. 1900, No. 5241). This establishes an OE. *lof*, sb. m, "fillet" "band," accepted by Toller in the Supplement to Bosworth. At first sight "fillet" or "head-band"

does not strike one as a likely instrument of torment, but the Peterborough annalist gives us a hint as to the sort of fillet or head-band intended only a few lines above the passage under immediate consideration:

"Men dide cnotted strenges abuton here hæved and wrythen to ðat it gæde to the hænes (Earle and Plummer, I, 264)."

From fillet, an innocuous article of apparel, *lof* may easily have been extended euphemistically to the sinister head-bands just mentioned.

If OE. *lóf* and eME. *lof* are identical (and nothing in the form or sense seems opposed to such an equation), we have, I think, a satisfactory solution of the problem, for we have *lóf*, sb., grammatically parallel to *gri(n)*, sb., and with a meaning appropriate to the present context. Taking *grin* to mean "noose" and *lof* "head-band (of some sort or other)," the passage might be translated:

"In many of the castles were 'head-band and noose'¹ which were (consisted) of chains, (of) which two or three men had enough (to do) to support one."

By this interpretation we at once save the reading of the MS., provide a suitable meaning for *lof*, by establishing *gri* as *grin*, sb. obviate the necessity doing violence to the syntax, and sharpen up the significance of the passage.

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

Cambridge, Mass.

¹ There is a possibility that *lóf* 7 *grin* are plurals. *Grin*, n. and f. in O.E. with the pl. *grinu* (Sievers-Cook, *Grammar of O.E.*, 3 ed., § 267b) may in dialect have lost the somewhat irregular flexional vowel after the analogy of long stem neuters. Under *lóf*, Toller cites OS. *Harláf*; this is a gloss to the Virgilian *licia* "id est quod dicimus *harláf*" (Steinmeyer and Sievers, *Ahd. Glossen*, II. 726a) and seems to be, here, a neut. pl. The OE. simplex *lóf*, if related to the OS. (for vocalism, cp. J. H. Gallee, *Altsäch. Gram.*, 2 ed. § 98), may also have existed as a neuter. If the ME. words are pl., we should probably want a comma after "head-bands," thus considering the clause '8 *twa oðer thre men . . .*' as modifying *grin*, a ponderous collar similar to such as may be seen in the Nürnberger Burg.

LANDOR'S CRITICISM IN POETRY

An estimate of Walter Savage Landor as a critic of literature is incomplete without notice of his criticism in verse. Landor's judgments on literature are found chiefly in the *Imaginary Conversations*, the *Pentameron*, and in the scattered records of his conversation. In addition, his habit of epigram led him to turn off numerous poems on men of letters, both of the past and of his own time. Of these a few have deservedly been included in anthologies; many are hidden in general collections of Landor's poetry; and a few are in his hitherto unpublished writings.

Many of the poems are whimsical and reflect transient moods. Often they are witty and sharply epigrammatic; Landor was always discharging couplets at his contemporaries. Their value lies in the fact that they exhibit very real feelings of Landor's on literature. Taken together they form a useful supplement to his other critical dicta.

Although such verse deals with all types of literature, most of it is concerned with that of Landor's own epoch. His deepest intellectual life was bound up in Greek and Latin literature, but he seldom apostrophized a Greek or Latin writer in ode or epigram. His verse comments on classical literature took the form of the *Hellenics* and the *Heroic Idyls*. He selected characters and scenes from the classics, letting them suggest what he thought of their original creators, but there are few direct invocations to his masters, such as Homer or Sophocles. (See *The Works of Walter Savage Landor*, 1846, II, 666, 639; and also *Heroic Idyls*, 1863, p. 181). Exceptions are the *Lines Written in a Catullus* (*Ibid.*, p. 178), and the short poem on Tibullus (*Ibid.*, p. 259).

In continental literature Landor's first interest was Dante, but there are also verse criticisms of other Italian and of French writers. Landor's well-known aversion to Frenchmen included their literature. His poems *To Victor Hugo* and *To Beranger at Tours* are animated by political rather than literary enthusiasm, Corneille, too, is praised for his courage; he is described as a descendant of Charlotte Corday. The lines to Hugo run:

Whether a poet yet is left
In France, I know not, and who knows?

But Hugo, of his home bereft,
 In quiet Jersey finds repose.
 Honour to him who dares to utter
 A word of truth in writ or speech.
 In Hugo's land the brave but mutter
 Half one, in dread whose ear it reach. (*Ibid.*, p. 160.)

On German literature, as in prose of Landor, there is silence. Many anecdotes tell us of his contempt for Goethe, and he had no higher regard for other Germans. On Spanish literature are the lines to Cervantes, among the recently published verse:

Cervantes was among my first delights,
 Nor was forgotten in maturer age. . . .
 (*Letters and Other Unpublished Writings of Walter Savage Landor*, p. 199.)

Poetry on Italian literature includes Alfieri, Petrarch, and Dante. Landor's tribute in prose to Alfieri occurs in his dialogue between *Alfieri and Metastasio* and in *Alfieri and Salomon the Florentine Jew*. The opening lines of the poem follow:

Alfieri, thou art present in my sight
 Tho' far removed from us, for thou alone
 Hast toucht the inmost fibres of the breast,
 Since Tasso's tears made damper the damp floor
 Whereon one only light came through the bars.
 (*Heroic Idyls*, p. 118.)

The three dialogues in which Petrarch is a character (and his important role in the *Pentameron*) are supplemented by the personal lines, *With Petrarca's Sonnets*. (*The Works of Walter Savage Landor*, II, 619). Landor's prejudice against Dante, freely expressed in the *Pentameron* and in the *Imaginary Conversations* finds no echo in his poem, *Dante*. This is exalted in tone and eulogistic: "Poet and prophet, give three worlds the law." (*The Last Fruit Off an Old Tree*, p. 426).

In pre-Shakespearean literature Landor was fond of Chaucer and detested Spenser. In the poem, *Chaucer*, he contrasts these two poets:

In Spenser's labyrinthine rhymes
 I throw my arms o'erhead at times,
 Opening sonorous mouth as wide

As oystershells at ebb of tide.

No bodyless and soulless elves

I seek, but creatures like ourselves. (*Heroic Idyls*, p. 142.)

This is a repetition of what Landor says of these two poets in prose. Perhaps Landor's highest compliment to Shakespeare was to prefer him to the ancients. Landor celebrates his genius in many allusions in verse and in the poems *Shakespeare in Italy* (*Ibid.*, p. 234), and *Shakespeare and Milton (The Last Fruit Off an Old Tree)*, p. 447). The trumpet notes of the latter poem are certainly among the very best from Landor. There is, besides, the brilliant epigram:

In poetry there is but one supreme,
Tho' there are many angels round his throne,
Mighty, and beauteous, while his face is hid.

(*Poems, Dialogues in Verse, and Epigrams*, by Walter Savage Landor, ed. C. G. Crump, II, p. 139. See also *Letters and Other Unpublished Writings of Walter Savage Landor*, poem on William von Schlegel, p. 225.)

The English writer between the Elizabethan age and his own whom Landor studied most was Milton. Besides the poem just mentioned, two poems on Milton are noteworthy: the lines *Written in Milton's Defense* (*Heroic Idyls*, p. 196), and *Milton in Italy* (*Supra*). Other verse criticisms of these intervening years were the two poems, both called *Daniel Defoe* (*Letters and Other Unpublished Writings of Walter Savage Landor*, pp. 203-203); *Cowley's Style* (*The Last Fruit Off an Old Tree*, p. 369); *On Pope* (*Dry Sticks Fagoted*, p. 79); *Gibbon* (*Ibid.*, p. 120); *Goldsmith and Gray* (*Ibid.*, p. 119). The quatrain on Swift and Pope is an imaginary epigram from Swift which concludes:

A little dentifrice and soap
Is all the harm I wish poor Pope.

In the rather long poem on Gibbon Landor praises the historian's style, as he had done in the *Imaginary Conversations*. He doubtless felt a natural sympathy for Gibbon's phraseology, which was, in some respects, like his own:

There are those who blame thee for too stately step
And words resounding from inflated cheek.

Words have their proper places, just like me,
 I listen to, nor venture to reprove,
 Large language swelling under gilded domes,
 Byzantin, Syrian, Persipolitan.

Gibbon is compared to Thucydides. Landon also praises, in the eighteenth century, Goldsmith and Gray in contrast to Byron "the school-girl's pet." Landon venerated Gray. He once remarked that if forced to choose the lines in English literature he would wish most to have written, he would hesitate between Gray's:

The boast of heraldry, the pomp of power

and George Herbert's:

Sweet day, so cool, so calm, so bright
 (for verse comments on Dryden, Johnson, Churchill,
 see *The Works of Walter Savage Landon*, II, 639;
 on Burns, *Heroic Idyls*, p. 181.)

Most of Landon's criticism of literature in verse is concerned with the nineteenth century. Probably no nineteenth century poet, except Swinburne, was so accustomed to record his impressions of contemporary literature in verse. There are, for example, no less than ten different poems (in English and Latin) on Southey. Two of these, *On the Death of Southey* (1853) (*Poems, Dialogues in Verse, and Epigrams*, ed. C. G. Crump, p. 232), and *On Southey's Death* (1858) (*Ibid.*, p. 267) are touched by deep and sincere emotion. No one who has read the first poem can forget the vision of Southey with his little son, and the second has all the stern grandeur of Landon's best epigrams:

Southey, my friend of forty years, is gone,
 And, shattered by the fall, I stand alone.

The other poems indicate in various ways what Landon found in Southey. He is "the rare architect of many a wondrous tale" (*The Works of Walter Savage Landon*, II, 670); "poet, sage, or hero" (*Ibid.*, p. 267); and he teaches "the song men ought to sing." (*The Last Fruit Off an Old Tree*, p. 387). Among the numerous poems on Wordsworth is that written in 1833, *To Wordsworth*. After the apostrophe to Wisdom, the inspirer of Words-

worth, come the lines which describe the kinship between Wordsworth and Landor:

We both have run o'er half the space
Listed for mortals' earthly race;
We both have crossed life's fervid line,
And other stars before us shine:
May they be bright and prosperous
As those that have been stars for us!
Our course by Milton's light was sped,
And Shakespeare shining overhead:
Chatting on deck was Dryden too,
The Bacon of the rhyming crew;
None ever cross'd our mystic sea
More richly stored with thought than he:
Tho' never tender or sublime,
He wrestles with and conquers Time.
To learn my lore on Chaucer's knee,
I left much prouder company;
Thee gentle Spenser fondly led,
But me he mostly sent to bed.

Another suggestion of like ideals in the two poets occurs in the poem, *Written at Hurstmonceaux, On Reading a Poem of Wordsworth's* (*The Works of Walter Savage Landor*, II, 670). Landor was hostile in his criticism of Wordsworth not only in the *Imaginary Conversations*, but in his poetry: we hear of Wordsworth's "curds and whey" (*Heroic Odys*, p. 187); or encounter the following: "Wordsworth's low coo brings over me sound sleep" (*Ibid.*, p. 181).

Landor's attitude towards Byron was constantly changing. His prose has many acknowledgments of Byron's powers. But the mutual irritation between them, which lasted till Byron's death—in Landor's eyes an atonement—called from Landor many a bitter line:

Like mad-dog in the hottest day
Byron runs snapping straight away,
And those fellows judge ill
Who go without a whip or cudgel. (*Ibid.*, p. 203.)

Landor did not understand Byron's misanthropy. The *Remonstrance and Advice to Byron* runs:

Say, Byron, why is thy attar
Profusely dasht with vinegar?

Each of them in its place is good,
 But neither fit for daily food.
 Open thy latticed window wide
 For breezes from the Aegean tide.

(*Ibid.*, p. 148. See also *The Works of Walter Savage Landor*, II, 639; *The Last Fruit Off an Old Tree*, p. 385; and *Heroic Idyls*, p. 203.)

The fine lines *To Browning* compare Browning to Chaucer. (*The Works of Walter Savage Landor*, II, 673). Landor's friendship with Charles Dickens inspired two poems, both called *To Dickens* (*Ibid.*, II, 670), besides an epigram (*Heroic Idyls*, p. 164). Hunt is humourously abused in *To Leigh Hunt, On an Omission in his "Feast of the Poets"* (*The Works of Walter Savage Landor*, II, 660), and in the poem *To Joseph Ablett* (*Ibid.*, II, 673) he is described as he "whom Dryden's force and Spenser's fays, Have heart and soul possess'd." Landor liked Macaulay's *Lays of Ancient Rome*. He praises them in *To Macaulay* (*Ibid.*, II, 673) and in the *Remonstrance to Macaulay* (*Heroic Idyls*, p. 147). Macaulay, he says

. . . . rushes on and hails by turns
 High-crested Scott, broad breasy Burns,
 And shows the British youth, who ne'er
 Will lag behind, what Romans were.

(*The Works of Walter Savage Landor*, II, 673.
 See also Macaulay's *Peerage in Dry Sticks Fagoted*, p. 64.)

The list of Landor's verse criticisms might be expanded. They include: Richard Milnes, Lamb, Barry Cornwall, Thackeray, Shelley, P. J. Bailey, Jeffrey, Gifford, Miss Mitford, Tennyson, T. J. Mathias, T. Garrow, R. Landor, and G. P. R. James. In all of these the reader will meet with Landor's wit, temper, quixotic enthusiasms, and high ideals as a critic of literature. (All the poems concerning the writers just mentioned may be found in the editions of Landor mentioned in this paper).

STANLEY T. WILLIAMS.

Yale University.

A NOTE ON JONSON'S *STAPLE OF NEWS*

None of Jonson's editors has offered an explanation of the word 'Naometry' which occurs in the following passage:

- 1 Customer. Have you in your profane shop any news
Of the saints at Amsterdam?
- Register. Yes; how much would you?
- 1 Customer. Six penny-worth.
- Register. Lay your money down.—Read, Thomas.
- Thomas. The saints do write, they expect a prophet shortly,
The prophet Baal, to be sent over to them,
To calculate a time, and half a time,
And the whole time, according to Naometry.
- Pennyboy junior. What's that?
- Thomas. The measuring of the temple; a cabal
Found out but lately, and set out by Archie,
Or some such head, of whose long coat they have heard,
And, being black, desire it.¹

There can be little doubt that Jonson is here referring to the *Naometria*, a work by the German antiquary and mystic Simon Studion.²

¹ Ben Jonson, *The Staple of News*, Act III, Scene 1. (*Works*, ed. W. Gifford, London, 1875, v, 228-30. The lines: 'To calculate . . . the temple'; serve to define *Naometry* in *The New English Dictionary*. No other example of the use of the word and no further comments upon its meaning appear there.

² I am entirely indebted to Arthur E. Waite's *The Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross* (London, 1924) for my material concerning Studion and his work. Waite maintains that the doctrines of the Rosicrucians have their origin in the *Naometria* and not in the works of Andreae to which they have generally been attributed. *Vide op. cit.*, pp. 35 ff., and Note xxi, p. 639.

The complete title of the *Naometria* is: *Naometria, seu nuda et prima Libri, intus et foris scripti per clavem Davidis et calamum virgae similem, Apertio: In quo non tantum cognoscenda tam S. Scripturae totius quam Naturae quoque universae Mysteria brevis sit Introductio. Verum etiam Prognosticus (Stellae illius Matutinae Anno Domini 1572 conspectae ductu) demonstratur Adventus ille Christi ante Diem novissimum Secundus, per quem, Homine Peccati, Papa, cum filio suo perditionis Mehameto, divinitus devastato, ipse Ecclesiam suam et principatus mundi*

Studion was born at Urach in Württemberg in 1543 and graduated at Tübingen in 1565. Later he is said to have become a 'preceptor' in Marbach, near Ludwigsburg. He was occupied, in part, with the collection of precious stones and monuments which is now in the Library at Stuttgart. In 1586 he may have attended at Lüneburg in Hanover a memorable assembly of a religious character, out of which there seems to have arisen the so-called 'Militia Crucifera Evangelica'—or otherwise, the Evangelical Brotherhood.³ For a time he appears to have been persecuted by his enemies because of the prophecies made in the first part of the *Naometria*.⁴ Quite uncertain is the date of his death.⁵

The *Naometria* is described by Waite as a quarto manuscript in Latin containing 1790 pages—exclusive of a preface or dedication to the Duke of Württemberg which runs for 177 pages.⁶ It was not completed until 1604, although Studion had written a part as early as 1593.⁷

Naometria signified "a mystic measurement—that is to say, of the temple—as if a deep understanding concerning it. The symbolical expression is reminiscent of Kabalistic tracts on the Delineation of the Celestial temples, the measurement of the Divine Body, and R. Eliezer's Measurement of the Earthly temple; but the immediate allusion is to the Apocalypse, x, 1."⁸ The work also contained a prophecy concerning the second Advent of Christ and the destruction of the Pope and Mahomet. In general Studion stood for all the doctrines of extreme protestantism.⁹

It is clear that Jonson connects the doctrines set forth in the *Naometria* with those professed by the Brownists. It seems highly

restaurabit, ut in iis post hac sit cum ovili Pastor Unus. In Cruciferae Militiae Evangelicae gratiam, authore Simone Studione inter Scorpiones. Pars Prima. . . Interlocutores Nathanael, Cleophas. Anno Consistorium, 1604. This is the general title. The work is divided into two parts and contains subtitles. There is also an appendix designated Hieroglyphicus Simonis Studionis, Versus de instantis temporis fato imminente. For subtitles vide Waite, *op. cit.*, Note xxi, p. 639.

³ Waite, *op. cit.*, pp. 39, 40.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 51, note 1.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 47-8.

⁶ Other matter brings the total number of introductory pages to 205. Vide Waite, *op. cit.*, p. 46, and cf. Note xxi, p. 639.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 642.

probable that these Dissenters, who had settled in Holland to escape persecution in England, had really come in contact, if not actually with a manuscript of the *Naometria*, at any rate with some account of its contents. But this was not until at least fifteen or sixteen years after the completion of Studion's work, since *The Staple of News* was played for the first time in 1626 and seems to have been written during the years 1622-23 with additions in 1625-26.¹⁰

The questions "How may the Brownists have become familiar with the *Naometria*?" and "How did Jonson learn about it?" can, at present, be answered only conjecturally. The Brownists were, if we may believe Jonson, introduced to this 'cabal' by 'Archie,' or 'some such head.' The connection of this particular name with the mysteries of the society has a double significance, for the Archie to whom Jonson refers was not only the court fool but also a bigoted devotee of the Scottish Church. Some similar adherent to the Reformed Church in Holland or in Germany, captivated by the bibliolatry and the burning Protestantism of Naometric teaching may well have begun either to expound it to the sympathetic 'saints,' or to set it forth compendiously in writing. It is easy to see that such teaching would have been most congenial to this sect of Amsterdam, for Studion and those whom he represented were 'looking for a renovation of the earth' and a 'general reform to come.' Ultra Protestant in their teaching, they were 'heated with apocalyptic dreams,' and regarded the Pope as Antichrist.

A priori, it seems most unlikely that Jonson ever saw a copy of the *Naometria*, for it was never printed. There are only two manuscripts of the work known to Waite. Both of these are in the Landesbibliothek at Stuttgart.¹¹ There is no record of it in the catalogues of manuscripts in the libraries of Great Britain and Ireland to which I have had recourse. What Jonson did know of Studion and Naometry was probably gained by travellers' tales of the doctrinal vagaries of the good 'saints of Amsterdam.'

JOHN F. ENDERS.

Harvard University.

¹⁰ *The Staple of News* by Ben Jonson, ed. D. Winter, New York, 1905, pp. xviii, xix, xx.

¹¹ Waite, *op. cit.*, p. 49.

REVIEWS

Taine et l'Angleterre, par F. C. ROE. Paris: Champion, 1923.
(Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée, Tome VI).

Taine had confidence in his *coup d'œil*. An impressive example of the fact had lately been provided by the publication of the fragmentary *Voyage en Allemagne*.¹ The critic had gone to Germany in 1870 in search of first-hand information for a book analogous to his *Histoire de la Littérature Anglaise*, and the resultant notes, interrupted almost immediately and covering a period of only twelve days, show him accumulating *petits faits*. He has not begun to organize, and his style in consequence lacks its usual architectonic excellence, but he is eager for a generalization, and on the last day he writes with satisfaction: "Je commence à pouvoir classer les types moraux. . . . Ce qui m'a gêné si longtemps, c'est le trait essentiel; le plus répandu de tous, l'indétermination." In a word he approaches a solution, after a *long* embarrassment, at the end of a sojourn of less than a fortnight.

His celerity of judgment in the case of England, Mr. Roe now shows, is hardly less; indeed before publishing his two books on Britain, Taine had spent there a total of only ten weeks.

Mr. Roe makes a thorough investigation of the reactions of guest and hosts and supplies an abundance of useful information concerning what places Taine visited, what kinds of people he met or failed to meet, and concerning his possession of the English language (which he knew admirably but pronounced atrociously, so that if he appreciated the music of English verse, as he claimed, it was certainly not the poets' music). There is a shrewd discussion of Taine's inadequate treatment of English humour, and the generalization that the critic's "interprétation des choses est statique et non dynamique," which is entirely in accord with Lord Morley's view,² is sound.³ The author would have found an excellent and significant example of this fact in Taine's treatment of

¹ *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1er décembre 1920.

² Cf. his review of *l'Ancien Régime* in *Critical Miscellanies*, III, 261 ff.

³ Less sound is the conception of Taine's doctrine revealed by the sentence "Tout déterministe qu'il soit, il se laisse séduire par le spectacle de la lutte morale" (p. 136). The consideration of "la lutte morale" is more constantly present in Taine's mind than this suggests. Cf. especially his letter to Bourget, on *le Disciple*, in *Correspondance*, IV, 287-293.

Shakespeare, but, contrary to the promise of the general title (revised in the first sentence of the preface), he deals only with Taine's views of nineteenth-century England.

What does Taine's treatment of England reveal in the last analysis, concerning his philosophy of criticism? Mr. Roe makes many valid objections to this or that specific conclusion of Taine, but he fails—and this may be said to be the disappointment of the book, otherwise so valuable—he fails to lead to the expected final appraisal. He brings up the issue once in terms of a quotation from Leslie Stephen ("étudier l'organisme dans son rapport avec le milieu"), but without comment, and about another discussion of the same issue his only remark is "très intéressant." There is risk here of arriving at a final chapter which, like that in Johnson's *Rasselas*, may be labelled a "Conclusion in which nothing is concluded." A scientific caution sparing of generalisations is commendable—but one might, without trespassing upon metaphysics, venture a hypothesis.

There seems to be one latent in Mr. Roe's material. His numerous objections to Taine's results are objections not to doctrine but to application. When Taine the relativist clearly fails it is, these cases seem to show, because he was not relativistic enough. The general difficulty, Mr. Roe says, is that Taine "n'a pas suffisamment pratiqué les diverses classes et les divers milieux." He did not differentiate adequately between the English and the Scotch. He did not understand Thackeray for lack of an intimate acquaintance with the *nuances* of his character. If he failed to comprehend the temperament of Swinburne as revealed on the occasion of a dinner party, it was because Taine did not know that Swinburne was seated too close to an unbearably hot fire and was devoting his attention not to the social function but to protecting his back with a copy of the *Times*. Here is proof that vice and virtue are products like vitriol and sugar. It would have been illuminating had Mr. Roe given us finally his specialist's opinion as to whether it was chiefly the deterministic theory or Taine's pioneer rashness in the application of it that is reprehensible.⁴ So far as

⁴No one can deny Taine's rashness, but it is severe to refer to his method as one "d'après laquelle les conclusions précèdent la documentation" (p. 44). Roe himself cites cases where Taine revises his opinion in the presence of new evidence (pp. 121, 135). Compare the significant problem of Taine's adaptability in the case of his judgment of Tennyson.

he has touched upon this subject he has shown nothing that essentially damages what seems to have been Taine's immense contribution to criticism.

In any case Mr. Roe's book is informing and readable. He is especially to be commended for the felicitous discovery of the unedited letters (from Arnold, Spencer, *et al.*) published in an Appendix. And a valuable addition to Giraud's *Bibliographie Critique*, of 1902 and now necessarily incomplete, is provided by his book-list.⁵

Amherst College.

HORATIO E. SMITH.

Die Grundlage der Phonetik, von Jörgen Forchhammer. Heidelberg: Winter, 1924. viii + 212 pp.

Mr. Forchhammer gives to his interesting and valuable treatise the following sub-title: *Ein Versuch, die phonetische Wissenschaft auf fester sprachphysiologischer Grundlage aufzubauen*. His program is ambitious, and in carrying it through he falls into error now and then, like the rest of us mortals. He has certainly succeeded, however, in giving a clear and systematic account of the phonetic side of speech, and in more cases than one he has

Taine inquired of Palgrave (the latter reports in his *Personal Recollections, Tennyson, a Memoir by his Son*, London, 1897, II, 497), concerning the supposed luxuriousness of Tennyson's surroundings, and being set right he, not perhaps eagerly, revised his first conjecture about the personal sybaritism of the poet. John Richard Green relates the same incident, as he heard it from Palgrave, but with a piquancy of his own and with his own downright conclusion about the inflexibility of the Frenchman: "M. Taine bit his lip, thanked him for his information, went home—and when the book came out, Tennyson was found still painted as the young voluptuary, the rich profligate of M. Taine's fancy. The story is really an index to the whole character of his book." (*Letters of J. R. Green*, London, 1901, p. 372). Professor Babbitt in his *Masters of French Criticism* (Boston, 1913, p. 343) accepts with mild foot-note reservation the interpretation of Green. But the text of the chapter on the poet does not paint Tennyson as personally a young voluptuary, Palgrave's account is more authentic than Green's, and Roe, who mentions only Palgrave, is in this instance—and properly—less severe.

⁵ Misprints seem few. We have noted: p. 32, *Lui*, read *lui*; p. 88, *Gobden*, read *Cobden*; p. 92, 1879, read 1789; p. 114, 1850, read 1859; p. 187, *Thiême*, read *Thieme*.

been able to clarify for us articulatory details that hitherto wanted an explanation.

The work under review is an expansion of an earlier paper of the author's; entitled *Systematik der Sprachlaute als Grundlage eines Weltalphabets*. And in fact most of the book is devoted to an exposition of yet a new system of phonetic notation. Mr. Forchhammer's world alphabet is carefully thought out and deserves to be studied. It suffers however from the usual deficiencies of such alphabets. The amount of detailed information which one must give in order to describe an articulation with scientific accuracy cannot be crowded within the compass of a single symbol, however adorned with diacritical marks. And since Mr. Forchhammer relies on diacritics more than do most of his fellows, his symbols are even more hopelessly overloaded than usual. Thus, over a dozen *Feinheiten* must be indicated by auxiliary signs placed under the symbol; how room is to be found for all these signs the author does not bother to explain. And there remain the numerous marks to go over the symbol, to its right and its left, and at its four corners!

Mr. Forchhammer's treatment of phonetic problems is noteworthy for brevity and clarity. He is a little too fond of polemics, and is prone to look upon his own ideas as the only possible ideas, but this too makes for clarity at least! And in spite of his rather assertive style the positions he takes are usually sane and sensible enough. But he has one bad habit, and it is a bad habit indeed. Whether his ideas be new or old, he almost invariably presents them as if they were new and revolutionary. Thus, he gives us a long polemic on the subject of stops; what he says was better said, long ago, by Jespersen, but the uninitiated reader will almost certainly imagine that Mr. Forchhammer was the original propounder of the theory which he expounds with so much vigor.

I will now turn to more detailed criticism, taking up only matters in which I differ with the author. On p. 6 the affricate in the German word *Hetz* is analyzed into two sounds, *t* and *s*, and an *Übergangslaut* connecting these—three sounds in all. I cannot subscribe to such an analysis, which does violence to one's natural *Sprachgefühl* and is open to serious objection even from a purely theoretical point of view. For affricates, like diphthongs, must be taken as single sounds, though of course they are complex,

not simple. It would be absurd to say that the diphthong [ai] is made up of the two sounds [a] and [i] and a transition sound connecting them. If we say [a] and follow it up with [i] we are far from getting [ai] as a result. In fact, [ai] is a glide, beginning somewhere about [a] and ending somewhere about [i]. It is one sound, composita, indeed, but thoroughly unified for all that. Hence it is easy to say an isolated [ai] but very hard if not impossible to isolate any one of its component parts. Similarly, the German affricate *z* or *tz* is one sound. It begins as a stop and ends as a spirant, it is true. In other words, it is composita, like the diphthong. But the stop differs from the simple *t*, the spirant from the simple *s*. Stop and spirant are welded together into a unified sound which cannot be split up and pronounced each element for itself. Were Mr. Forchhammer a native German he would feel this, I think. Certainly he would hardly analyze his own Danish affricate *t* as stop + transition sound + spirant.

On pp. 8 f. the author makes a journey to Greenland in order to find a non-explosive variety of [k, t, p]. But surely so long a pilgrimage was needless. In English such non-explosive stops are familiar enough. They occur with great regularity in final position, as in such a word as *hat* at the end of a sentence. Here (in American pronunciation, at least) the pause begins with the stop, and though of course the tongue is withdrawn from the gums sooner or later, minutes or even hours may elapse before the withdrawal takes place. In other words, the withdrawal, when it does take place, is no part of the articulation of the *t*, an articulation which concluded, of course, when the pause set in.

On p. 46 we are told that the oral resonance chamber gets its shape through the sagittal movements of the tongue, the vertical movements of the jaw and the horizontal movements of the lips. But the tongue too has its horizontal movements: as I have elsewhere explained, its two lateral zones may move towards each other or away from each other. The centripetal motion makes the so-called round vowels; the centrifugal, the so-called spread vowels. The horizontal movements of the lingual zones are usually accompanied by corresponding movements of the lips. Hence rounding at least has come to be associated with the labial articulation. But it is easy enough to produce a round vowel without rounding

the lips, as the reader will learn if he tries it. The activities of the lips are secondary, those of the tongue primary, in the formation of both round and spread vowels. Mr. Forchhammer, like all phoneticians unacquainted with my *Phonology of Modern Icelandic*, has failed to analyze properly this aspect of lingual articulation.

In working out a universal vowel system the author contents himself with a two-fold division according to place of articulation: front vowels and back vowels. He regards the setting up of an intermediate group (mean or "mixed" vowels) as a useless complication. Indeed, he issues a kind of challenge. He says (p. 51), "Mir ist jedenfalls keine einzige Sprache bekannt, in der . . . Vorder-, Mittel- und Hinterzungenvokale prinzipiell als verschiedene Sprachlaute nebeneinander Verwendung finden. . . ." This challenge can be easily met. In Norwegian, the vowels *o*, *u*, *y* are all high and rounded. They are distinguishable only by their place of articulation, viz., back, mean and front respectively. Similarly, in English the vowel sounds in the words *far*, *fur*, *fare* are all low and spread. They too are distinguishable only by their place of articulation, viz., back, mean and front respectively. I therefore look upon it as a fundamental defect in Mr. Forchhammer's system that he makes no provision for mean vowels.

A similar objection can be raised to the author's consonant system; he provides for dentals and velars, but not for palatals. Indeed, he does not consider it necessary to carry out even the distinction between dentals and velars, when he comes to deal with r-sounds, while he groups [j] and [ɤ] alike under the head "Vorderzunge." His table of *Engelaute* especially, or "straits," as I call them, is open to serious objection on the ground of inconsistency. Moreover, it has other defects. The author classifies straits into *Hautreibelaute*, *Zahnreibelaute*, *Anblaselaute* and *Zitterlaute*. The classification is new and interesting, but suffers, I think, from incurable weaknesses. Mr. Forchhammer is justly concerned to work the liquids into his classification, not being content to leave them outside as a class (or two classes) to themselves. He was unable to do anything with r-sounds, however, and was compelled to classify them as trills, and give them a column all by themselves, although in fact the trill is by no means essential to the articulation of an [r] and often fails to appear—

and this not by reduction either, as the author supposes. The [l] lent itself better to systematizing, and by a *tour de force* Mr. Forchhammer was able to include it among his *Zahnreibelaute*. Yet in order to include it there he was compelled to make the friction of the breath-stream against the back teeth the fundamental characteristic of all [l] sounds! As a matter of fact, this friction is of little consequence. A gentleman of my acquaintance, who has no teeth at all, nevertheless says his [l] famously! The characteristic [l]-closure along the middle line of the roof of the mouth causes the breath-stream to break into two side streams at the point of closure. Ordinarily the closure is at the gums or teeth. The stream breaks, then, on the clive (i. e., the fore wall of the mouth), and is forced out against the lips and (to a less extent) the cheeks. The air finally makes its escape, of course, by being forced out between the lips. Such friction as takes place is mostly concentrated in the front part of the mouth, against which the air stream is continually being driven. The teeth, and particularly the back teeth, play a very subordinate part in breaking the stream and producing fricative sounds. The inner cheek walls immediately around the labial orifice do most of the breaking and give most of the fricative effect. The lower lip is of especially great importance here, as also in s- and š-sounds. Mr. Forchhammer's table, then, can hardly be called satisfactory. The following table is based on the classification in my *Phonology of Modern Icelandic*. Although not reduced to terms so simple as Mr. Forchhammer's, it is, I think, more in accord with the facts:

Stem Straits

back			front	
fast bar	loose bar	clear	fast bar	clear
vibrant velar [ɫ]	velar [r]	[g]	pal. [l]	[j]
surd velar [ɫ̥]	velar [r̥]	[x]	pal. [l̥]	[ç]

Crown Straits

fast bar		loose bar			clear		
		thick	mean	thin	thick	mean	thin
vibrant dent.	[ɮ]	[ʒ]	[ʀ]	[r]	[z]	Span. [ð]	Eng. [ð]
surd dent.	[ɮ̥]	[ʒ̥]	—	[r̥]	[s]	Span. [p̥]	Eng. [p̥]

Lip Straits

	thick mean thin		
vibrant	[w]	[v]	[v]
surd	[h]	[J]	[f]

One might discuss other questions raised by the author. But limitations of space forbid, and I will conclude by saying that the work under review, though it contains not a few errors and dubious analyses, yet remains stimulating and instructive by virtue of the author's freshness of approach and originality of treatment. It is a dangerous book for the beginner, but a useful book for the initiated.

KEMP MALONE.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Gédéon Huet, *Les contes populaires*. Paris, E. Flammarion, 1923.
192 pp. (Bibliothèque de Culture générale).

The science of Folklore has recently lost two of its most able representatives in France, Emmanuel Cosquin and Gédéon Huet. The latter died while his last work was in press.

As a manual the little book of M. Huet will be a safe and practical guide for beginners and laymen. In the first chapter (*Le problème des contes populaires*) a rapid survey of the study of fairy tales is given, beginning with the first critical essays on Perrault's collection. Classifying the existing folk-tales M. Huet distinguishes fairy tales proper (*contes merveilleux*), serious stories of a more realistic character (*contes*), merry tales (*fabliaux*), and animal tales (*contes d'animaux*). The outstanding feature of all folk-tales is the existence of fixed types found in the most widely separated countries, and their truly international character. To account for this fact three great theories have been established, namely (1) the mythical theory of the Grimms, G. W. Dasent and Max Müller, (2) the Oriental theory of Benfey and Cosquin, and (3) the anthropological theory of Lang and Tylor. On pp. 38 ff. a good review is given of fairy tales and fairy tale motifs occurring in ancient literature. Certain tales show by their plot that they can have been invented only in a definite period and in a definite civilization.

Chapter II (*Evolution et formation des contes populaires*) begins with a definition of the term Popular Tale: Les contes populaires sont des récits traditionnels, oraux, transmis surtout—mais non exclusivement—par des gens du peuple. M. Huet adds significantly that this definition does not answer the question of origin, that a literary story may for instance become a popular one, a fact, be it said, long recognized for folk-songs. These tales are not told to children only but, especially in backward societies, to adults as well. The story-tellers are sometimes men, generally however old women. The main difference between folk-tales and legends is that no belief is attached to the former, while the latter put forth some claim to historicity. A folk-tale may become a legend by the introduction of historical or pseudo-historical data. Certain outstanding features common to most folk-tales (no definite time and place and the happy ending), and especially the treatment accorded to the upper classes of society, while the hero, usually a poor devil, conquers all obstacles by good luck or his own intelligence, permit us to conclude that our folk-tales are essentially the work of the lower strata of society, leaving out of account such as may have arisen at a time anterior to the division of human society into various social strata. Many tales furthermore clearly show the hand of women narrators, while others were certainly invented with a moral aim in view (respect of taboos, honoring the dead, etc.). Coming to the question of origins, M. Huet rejects the theory of polygenesis, according to which a tale could have been invented independently in different localities and at different times. This theory may hold for simple motifs, but it cannot be assumed for whole stories representing a complicated plot and a contamination of very definite motifs in the same order. On p. 84 he develops the rules which must guide the investigator in his task to determine the country and time of the origin and the courses of the migration of any given folk-tale type, and he illustrates these rules by numerous examples.

In Chapter III (*Les contes populaires et la littérature*) M. Huet points out the existence of fairy tales in ancient and mediaeval literature (Old Testament, *Odyssey*, Apuleius, *Basin*, *Berthe aux grand pieds*, *Chevalier au Cygne*, *Merchant of Venice*, *Don Juan*, etc.), and he ends his little book with a survey of the great Oriental compilations from the *Jatakas* to the *Arabian Nights*.

There are few points on which folklorists might take exception to M. Huet's lucid and fair exposition. The most important is doubtless the absence of bibliographical data and an index. Two theories have been disposed of altogether too lightly, the mythical one of Max Müller and the dream theory of L. Laistner. The fact that both have been grotesquely exaggerated by indiscreet disciples must not blind us to the fact that there are cases in which they are still applicable, though neither can be said to open a majority of all mythological locks.

If as an American and an admirer of M. Huet's work I may be allowed to make a suggestion I venture to add this. Inasmuch as the valuable contributions of the great folklorist are scattered in learned journals most of which are not accessible in the States, would it not be a good undertaking to republish the most valuable of them in a separate volume of *Mélanges*? The *Bibliothèque Nationale* may well afford to pay this last tribute to its servant. But if this should not prove feasible, even a printed pamphlet containing an index of M. Huet's writings would be very helpful.

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE.

University of Minnesota.

The Background of Gray's 'Elegy.' A Study in the Taste for Melancholy Poetry, 1700-1751. By Amy Louise Reed, Ph. D., Professor of English, Vassar College. Columbia University Press, 1924.

Since the appearance of Professor H. A. Beers's excellent *History of English Romanticism in the Eighteenth Century* (1910), additional light has been thrown upon melancholy literature of the time by monographs upon individual writers, by Dr. Van Tieghem's brief but suggestive survey in *La Poésie de la Nuit et des Tombeaux en Europe au XVIII^e Siècle* (1921), and by Professor Raymond D. Havens's thorough study of Miltonic imitations. Miss Reed has undertaken to reintegrate the most popular and typical manifestations of the mood for the purpose of replacing Gray's *Elegy* against its original background. The six chapters of her study explain, respectively, "The Seventeenth

Century Definition of Melancholy," "The Taste for Melancholy in 1700," "The Revolt against Melancholy, 1700-1725," "Melancholy and Description, 1725-1750," "The Persistence of Melancholy and its Ethical Condemnation, 1725-1750," "The Perfection of Form; Gray's 'Elegy,' 1751." All students of the eighteenth century will be grateful for a detailed study of a very important psychological phenomenon which has never before been treated in its entirety. Some historians of the period have been inclined to dismiss the solemnity of grave-yard poetry as the affectation of a literary cult; Miss Reed's investigation makes it clear that the melancholy of poetry was deeply rooted in the national temper and was, moreover, merely a continuation of a chronic habit.

The subject is so broad and has so many ramifications that a somewhat arbitrary selection of material was perhaps unavoidable. With this fact in mind and with no intention of detracting from the merits of a valuable contribution to scholarship, I take the liberty of suggesting additions which, in my opinion, would materially improve the worth of the book. In a preliminary study of the seventeenth-century melancholists, attention might very properly be given to the two perfect exemplars in poetry—George Wither and divine Quarles—especially to their *Emblems*, for these were unquestionably known by the melancholy fraternity of the next century, directly and indirectly through imitators. As Miss Reed's work proves, the universal *materia poetica* of the atrabilious versifiers was death. Long since (as far back as the Middle Ages) gruesome illustrations had become an inseparable adjunct of the *meditatio mortis*, and, as Douce's study of the Dance of Death evinces, neither the literary nor the pictorial representation of the King of Terrors can be studied wholly apart from its complement. These two modes of morbid suggestion were united perfectly in the Emblem of the seventeenth century. Also if the *ne plus ultra* of pre-Restoration gloom is sought—the climax of the movement and the complete anticipation of Young's unmitigated solemnity—it will be found in *Midnight Meditations of Death* (1646), a volume of mortuary verse effectively advertised as having been "perused" by the divine Quarles himself immediately before he died. Habington, of the same period, demands at least a reference because, if for no other reason, some passages

in the final section of *Castara* were lingering in Gray's memory when he composed the *Elegy*.

In spite of a few notable exceptions—Flatman's poetry, for example, and John Quarles's—it is obvious that the prestige of literary melancholy suffered a sudden decline after 1660. Towards the close of the century, however, there was a complete recrudescence of pious sentiment. These fluctuations in taste are noted by Miss Reed. It is somewhat surprising to find nothing said in this connection of the lugubrious contributions made by John Dunton. Most of these, to be sure, were mere compilations of stolen material; but the dishonesty of the "methodizer" in no way detracts from their significance as either a symptom or an influence. Dunton is one of the unmistakable links of connection between two ages of literary religiosity. His projects would indeed afford an ideal starting-point for a study of the relations between the two periods. Miss Reed has discussed the pessimistic influence of Rochester; it would be well to include also the morbid use made of the brilliant young cynic's death in the moralized reports published by Burnet and others. These probably did more to intimidate the gay and to solemnize the middle classes than any other sensational reading they had except the story of Francis Spira's death. Rochester, in fact, became a renegade to his party and betrayed the cause of Restoration skepticism into the hands of the puritanic. For a contrary reason, the diagnosis of poetical taste in 1700 suffers through the omission of the flood of elegy that issued in 1695 from poets of all ranks (Dryden excepted) to bewail the death of Queen Mary. This one chapter in funeral literature might well have been excepted from the arbitrary exclusion of elegies, for it left a definite stain.

Miss Reed studies intensively only the period between 1700 and 1751, the date of the *Elegy*. She could have made excellent illustrative use of the pseudo-Bunyan prose piece, *Meditations on the Several Ages of Man's Life* (1701), M. Smith's Miltonic poem *The Vision, Or A Prospect of Death, Heav'n and Hell*, etc. (1702), and other poems from the same uninspired pen. One of the most striking manifestations resulted from the death of Lady Grace Gethin in 1697. Her pious remains, published as *Reliquiae Gethinianae* (1699), though since treated with merriment by Dis-

raeli, were honored in a later edition by a prefatory poem from Congreve. The same tragic event inspired Lady Gethin's mother, the Lady Frances Norton, to publish *The Applause of Virtue* (1705), with which was included *Memento Mori: Or, Meditations on Death*. I must insist that Miss Reed's omission of this monumental piece makes a gap all-thing unbecoming in a study of Queen Anne melancholy. In general, the later period is treated much less thoroughly than the early portions of the study lead us to expect. Without insisting upon an exhaustive consideration of a literary type which may easily lead the historian into monotonous repetition, we may reasonably expect a more detailed examination of the special field (1700-1751) than of the historical background. Instead, Miss Reed's scale of treatment apparently diminishes as she proceeds; the result is, we are given an inadequate conception of what was taking place among melancholy *poetae minimi* when Gray made his contribution. The Seatonian prize was established at Cambridge for the specific purpose of encouraging poems upon "Death, Judgment, Heaven, Hell," and similar topics to be announced by the committee. The prize was first awarded to Moses Browne in 1738. From that time on, the Seatonian prize-poem was awaited annually by a complacently gloomy public until all the hopes ever cherished were completely rewarded by Beilby Porteus's masterpiece, *Death: A Poetical Essay* (1759). Classic eminence was attained also by Joseph Trapp's poem, *Thoughts upon the Four Last Things* (1734). Two of the strangest specimens are Thomas Uvedale's *The Death-Bed Displayed with the State of the Dead* (1727) and *The Fear of Death. An Ode* (1739), said to have been written by the notorious Duke of Wharton in his final fit of penitence. The masses of the English people of the eighteenth century were more literal-minded and mediocrally gloomy than we can well believe without the most explicit and detailed proof. Some phases of the evidence are not even suggested by Miss Reed, such as the absurd funeral customs and the universal habit of attending executions. It seems also that if Burton's *Anatomy* (1621) is worthy of detailed study for a proper background we might profit from the numerous studies of the "English Malady" which were composed by contemporary pathologists. Our sense of the reality of the general disorder will

be deepened also if we examine some of the numerous comments made upon the melancholy English in the letters of foreign visitors.

From another point of view, considerable attention is due the Chaucerian and antiquarian John Dart; his *Westminster Abbey. A Poem* (1721) preceded the publication of Parnell's *Night-Piece* and may therefore be regarded as a pioneer in the poetical fashion of taking readers to actual places of interment, which, after all, is the only distinctive characteristic of eighteenth-century poetry of death as compared with seventeenth. Dart selected for the *locale* of his moralizings the principal British Temple of Death. In this respect he had no immediate successors, for the cicerones who came after him preferred to visit the humbler dead; but he is not a negligible symptom in the evolution of the grave-yard *genre*. While religious sentiment and the religious counsels concerning death provide the main materials of literary melancholy, there were other, and less distressing, types of the mood. The most significant apparently was melancholy descriptions of nature. In this department of her work Miss Reed might well have consulted Professor Havens's two articles, "Literature of Melancholy" (*M. L. N.*, xxvii, 226) and "Romantic Aspects of the Age of Pope" (*P. M. L. A.*, xxvii, 297).

On the whole, Miss Reed's work is commendably accurate in detail. *A Pastoral Reflection on Death*, referred to as anonymous (p. 75), was published in 1691 under the name of the author, John Potenger. On p. 116 *Thebias* is misprinted for *Thebais*. The 1700 edition of Donne's *Biathanatos*, mentioned as the second (p. 82, note) was, I think, the third. But inaccuracies of this kind are very infrequent.

C. A. MOORE.

University of Minnesota.

William Austin, The Creator of Peter Rugg. Being a Biographical Sketch of William Austin, together with the Best of his Short Stories. Collected and Edited by his Grandson, Walter Austin. Boston, Marshall Jones Company, 1925.

The present work is the first extended biography of William Austin, the creator of Peter Rugg. In 1855 Evert A. Duyckinck

sketched the salient facts of Austin's life in the *Cyclopaedia of American Literature*, and in 1890 Austin's son, James, published his father's chief works, prefaced by a twelve-page summary of his life, under the title of *The Literary Papers of William Austin*. Using as nucleus for a new life the biographical facts presented in *The Literary Papers*, Walter Austin, William's grandson, has added a definite body of new material gleaned from contemporary documents, periodicals, and newspapers. The biographer also received valuable assistance from certain manuscript-notes preserved by his uncle, Arthur Williams Austin.

This work may perhaps be more accurately described as a compilation, than as a well unified biography. The source material used by Walter Austin has not always been employed to the best advantage. Long quotations and copious extracts from William Austin's works, unrelieved either by comment or summary, not infrequently suggest a lack of organization. This defect is particularly noticeable in the chapter on *Peter Rugg*, where contemporary and posthumous comment appear in bewildering confusion. The book as a whole, however, is far superior to the pious and adulatory biography ordinarily written by a son or relative of a distinguished man of letters, and easily surpasses such works as *The Literary Life of James K. Spaulding* by his son, William; and *Pierre Irving's Life and Letters of Washington Irving*. There is a certain accuracy particularly to the biographical chapters of the book that is refreshing to the scholar. The sources are throughout carefully documented, and abundant foot-notes, supplemented by a bibliography in the Appendix, make the book of decided value in a field where so much inaccurate and unscholarly work has been done.

Like many American authors during the first few decades of the nineteenth century, William Austin was in no sense a professional man of letters. His interest in literature was throughout his life that of the amateur who indulges a natural *penchant* for writing as a relaxation from the strain of business duties. So little, indeed, did he regard the products of his pen, that he promptly returned to Joseph Buckingham, editor of *The New England Galaxy* and *The New England Magazine*, all money sent him for contributions to those periodicals. Thus one looks in vain in the record of Austin's life for the struggle of a young author to attain literary recognition and distinction. Austin's biography concerns itself

rather with his career as a lawyer and politician. Soon after his graduation from Harvard in 1798, he was appointed chaplain in the Navy,—a post which he subsequently resigned to study law in England. Chapters entitled "Legal Career" and "Political Life" trace with some accuracy Austin's professional activities. The "Austin-Elliot Duel," the result of a political controversy, and an event in Austin's life the details of which he for many years sought to suppress, is also carefully described.

William Austin's literary reputation rests chiefly upon his tales, five in number. In *Peter Rugg, The Missing Man*, the first of the series, contributed to *The New England Galaxy*, for September 10, 1824, Austin made a permanent contribution to the legend literature of America. Employing the *motif* of the Wandering Jew or the Flying Dutchman, Austin produced a myth which successfully localized this curious legend in America. Told in a fragmentary manner, as the author now reports a conversation he has had with one who has seen Rugg, and now relates a personal experience with the mysterious man, the story possesses a vague, shadowy reality, suggestive of the supernatural appearances of this strange rider and his child. The tale shows the obvious influence of Rip Van Winkle in the bewilderment of Rugg, as he frequently comes in contact with men of a new generation.

The remaining tales are, upon the whole, less successful, and exhibit the weaker side of Austin as a story-teller. Humorous and satirical digressions often intrude themselves upon the narrative, and disturb the unity of the story. *The Man with the Cloaks*, another attempt to produce a local legend, shows these defects. Here didacticism and satire go hand in hand. Mr. Grindall, an old miser, refusing a cloak to a stranger in distress, soon afterwards becomes so cold, that he finds it necessary to add a cloak a day to his body, to keep himself warm. He is gradually cured of his malady by giving away one by one his many cloaks to needy persons. The satire of the tale concerns chiefly the disputing doctors who attend Grindall during his illness. As in *Peter Rugg*, a curse or prophecy serves as the starting point for the story.

In *Martha Gardner; or, Moral Reaction*, Austin portrays a widow relentlessly pursued by a corporation, which, though apparently successful in involving her in ruin, is ultimately defeated by her

moral force and persuasion. The situation here depicted was probably familiar to Austin as a lawyer, who levels much of his satire at the corporation. The story closes with an eloquent and effective curse.

The Late Joseph Natterstrom is another tale in which the satirical and didactic elements are uppermost. The story both satirizes in general the New York business man, and provides in particular for the ultimate reward of a righteous man after thirty years of hardship and apparent failure. The oriental background of the tale produces a curious atmosphere.

It is impossible to justify the existence of *The Sufferings of a Schoolmaster* except on the grounds of satire and burlesque. It is too exaggerated, forced, and positively ridiculous to serve even as propaganda against underpaid schoolmasters. A possible clue to Austin's purpose in writing the tale is contained in his own reference in the story to *Riley's Narrative*, which, he says, he has recently been reading. The work thus alluded to was published in 1817, and written by James Riley, a sea captain. The work purported to be "an authentic narrative of the loss of the American Brig Commerce, wrecked on the western coast of Africa, in the month of August, 1815, with an account of the sufferings of her surviving officers and crew." It is probable that in *The Sufferings of a Country Schoolmaster* Austin was burlesquing this and other similar works, wherein the sufferings of travelers are depicted in such glowing terms! The author may also have intended a fling at certain melodramatic qualities of the novels of Charles Brockden Brown.

With all their defects, and there are many, Austin's stories possess an atmosphere of their own, which quite defies analysis. It is undoubtedly true that these tales paved the way for the work of Poe and Hawthorne. In reprinting the stories of his grandfather, Walter Austin has performed a distinct service for students.

NELSON F. ADKINS.

Washington Square College,
New York University.

CORRESPONDENCE

MILTON AND THE *Physiologus*.

Milton in *Paradise Lost* twice at some length describes leviathan, first (l. 200-208) in a comparison with Satan lying on the fiery lake, and later (l. 410-416) in the catalogue of created things. The source of these passages, though editors of Milton seem to have missed it, and in several cases give erroneous explanations, is the ubiquitous *Physiologus*, that collection of moral tales based upon fabulous natural history, of which one chapter, too long to quote here,¹ uses the tale of a sea-monster, so huge as to be mistaken for an island, to point out the similar deceitful quality of the devil. I do not find the *Physiologus* anywhere cited as a source for any part of Milton; yet there is no doubt as to its connection with these passages. It is surely a book which Milton would be likely to know; indeed, in view of the widespread popularity of the collection, it would be strange if he had not come upon at least one of the many versions. Nothing could be more natural, therefore, than that, desiring a simile to mark the immensity of Satan, he should borrow the Naturalist's picture of the devil in the guise of the 'hugest of living creatures.'

One other interesting thing about these passages is their verbal similarity to the account of the 'whale' in the Old English *Physiologus*.² Just how extensive was Milton's knowledge of Old English would, indeed, be difficult to determine,³ but, surely, if he had had the texts, he could have found a way to read them. The text of the Old English *Physiologus* lay in the Codex Exoniensis in Exeter Cathedral from about the middle of the eleventh century until 1841, when Thorpe published practically the entire codex. It is at least not impossible that Milton may have seen this manuscript, or even some other copy of the poem now no longer extant. The following similarities are arresting.

In the first place, the expression, 'swim the ocean-stream,' occurring near the beginning and setting the tone of the passage, while it may be, as one editor suggests, a reminiscence of 'Homer's *ῥόος* (or *ποταμός*) *ὠκεάνοιο*,' seems to me just such a compound as continually occurs in Old English. Moreover, it is almost a literal

¹ A translation of this chapter, together with a discussion of the whole *Physiologus*, will be found in the introduction to A. S. Cook's *The O. E. Phoenix, Elene, and Physiologus*, Yale University Press, 1919.

² Namely, ll. 1-23. The best text is Cook's, in the edition cited or, with two translations, in *Yale Studies in English LXIII*.

³ The question—in connection with the resemblance between *P. L.* and the *Cædmon Paraphrase*—has more than once been discussed. Compare, e. g., for conflicting opinions, A. S. Cook, *Academy* 34. 402 and J. O. Westwood, *Academy* 35. 10 with R. P. Wuelker, *Anglia* 4. 401-405 and E. N. S. Thompson, *Essays on Milton* (Yale Univ. Press, 1914), p. 160, *et passim*.

translation of 'fyrgenstrēama geflotan,' and holds a position in Milton's passage corresponding to that of 'fyrgenstrēama geflotan' in the Old English poem. 'The pilot . . . , deeming some island, oft, as seamen tell, . . . ' is very close to

swā þæt wēnaþ wāgliþende
þæt hȳ on ēalond sum ēagum wlitēn.

'Deeming some island' is suspiciously like the over-compression of translation such as we find indulged in elsewhere by Milton⁴ when he renders the Horatian 'credulus aurea' by 'credulous, all gold,' a version which quite obscures the meaning. 'Scaly rind' is represented in the Old English by 'hīw gelīc hrēofum stāne.' The reference to Norway is easily explained by Milton's identification of the monster with the whale, but the presence of the Old English version might even more definitely have suggested northern seas, and, indeed, might have fixed more firmly in Milton's mind the popular idea of 'whale' as the equivalent of 'leviathan.' In the second passage from *Paradise Lost*, 'wallowing unwieldy' reminds us of Milton's liking for alliteration; and 'stretched like a promontory' and 'seems a moving land' lay stress upon the very detail which the Old English poet so conspicuously chooses for elaboration. Altogether, then, although these comparisons do not prove that Milton's source was not one of the Latin or Greek versions, yet, added to the strong resemblance in handling and in poetic tone, they make what seems to me a real probability that Milton may have seen the poem in its noble Old English version.

University of Indiana.

JAMES HALL PITMAN.

SHAKESPEARE AND SENECA?

As to Seneca and Hotspur (*MLN*, XL, 380), cf. Nashe, *The Anatomie of Absurditie*, 1589 (Grosart, I, 18-19; McKerrow, I, 13-14):—"Valerius in *Epist. ad Ruf.* hath these words of a womans trecherous works. . . . Furthermore, in the same place he saith, *Quis muliebri garrulitati aliquid committit, quæ illud solum potest tacere quod nescit*: who will commit any thing to a womans tatling trust, who conceales nothing but that shee knowes not?" The passage is not in Walter Map's famous epistle *Dissuasio Valerii ad Rufinum philosophum ne uxorem ducat* (*De Nugis Curialium*, iv, 3-5; St. Jerome, *Opera*, Paris, 1706. v, 337-341).

As to Lady Percy and Seneca, cf. North's "Brutus" (ed. 1595. p. 1058).

G. L. KITTREDGE.

⁴ Translation of Horace, *Carm.*, l. 5, included in any edition of Milton.

THREE GENERATIONS OF ONE LINE

In stanza 102 of Henry More's *Præexistence of the Soul* (*Philosophicall Poems*, Cambridge, 1647) is the line: "She is one Orb of sense, all eye, all airy ear." In *Paradise Lost* (vi, 350) Milton wrote: "All Heart they live, all Head, all Eye, all Eare." Finally we find a similar line in Shelley's *Queen Mab* (vi, 1): "All touch, all eye, all ear." Each of these passages contrasts the universal sense-organs of spirits with the limited perceptions of man, though with characteristic differences, for More was discussing the state of the human soul before it is imprisoned in the flesh; Milton, the state of angels and devils; and Shelley, the superhuman fairy queen.

There is no reason to assume that these parallels are mere coincidence. Newton, of course, referred Milton's line to Pliny's account of God (*Nat. Hist.*, i, vii): "totus est sensus, totus visus, totus auditus, totus animae, totus animi, totus sui." Milton certainly knew his classics, but none the less he could not have avoided reading the works of the Cambridge Platonist. And Shelley, as has been demonstrated in R. D. Havens's *Influence of Milton*, knew his Milton thoroughly, though this parallel is not included in Professor Havens's long list of parallels.

Harvard University.

S. FOSTER DAMON.

REPLY TO MR. B. M. WOODBRIDGE

In a recent issue of *Modern Language Notes*,¹ Mr. Woodbridge attacks my article on *The Romanticism of Guy de Maupassant*.² He suggests that I proposed *Don Juan* as a source for an episode in *Bel-Ami*, ignoring the fact that I said: "It is extremely unlikely that our author ever read *Don Juan*."³ Mr. Woodbridge admits readily that while *Bel-Ami* was not directly imitated from *Don Juan*, it belongs to the "*genus Don Juan*," and such is precisely my contention.

Mr. Woodbridge thinks that the source of the episode in question is probably the scene between Emma and Léon in the cathedral at Rouen, as described in *Madame Bovary*. I made the same statement six years ago, in an article entitled *Literary Relationships of Guy de Maupassant*.⁴

O. H. MOORE.

Ohio State University.

¹ XXXIX, 3, pp. 185-187.

² PMLA., XXXIII, 1, pp. 96-134.

³ Ibid., p. 112.

⁴ MP., xv, p. 649. On the same page I note that I am anticipating the conclusions of the then unpublished thesis of Miss Agnes R. Riddell: *Flaubert and Maupassant, a Study in Literary Relationships*.

NEW CHAUCER ITEMS

In the recently printed *Calendar of Close Rolls* (1392-96) are three records relating to Geoffrey Chaucer which have seemingly never been printed. These documents will appear in the December number of *Modern Language Notes*.

E. P. KUHLMAN.

Goucher College.

"ALLES FÜR RUHM UND IHR."

A very interesting example of the sovereign disregard with which Carlyle sometimes treated historical facts is found in his correspondence with Jane Welsh. From the very outset of their acquaintance Carlyle was deeply in love with the beautiful and proud girl from Haddington, who after a long courtship was to become his wife. Shyly he often expresses his admiration for her in phrases from foreign languages, mostly German. In a letter dated January 14th, 1822 we read: "I seem to have a motive and a rallying-word in the fight of life: when the battle is waxing fierce without, and the heart is waxing faint within, I shall remember it and do bravely. *Alles für Ruhm und Ihr!*" But this rallying-word was ill received by Jane Welsh. "*Alles für Ruhm und Ihr!!*," she replies, "On my word, most gay and gallantly said! One would almost believe the man fancies I have fallen in love with him, and entertain the splendid project of rewarding his literary labours with my self." Carlyle hastens to repair his mistake in the next letter: "I merely wish to say that when you read Schiller's History of the Thirty-Years War, you will like Bernhard von Weimar as much as I do. On going forth to fight beside Gustavus the Lion of the North, Bernhard wrote this epigraph on his standard: "*Alles für Ruhm und Ihr.*" And who was She? A great King's daughter, a brave King's Wife: and all the poor *Ritter* hoped for, was a smile from her fair countenance to greet his triumph, or a tear from her bright eyes to hallow his last and bloody bed. Perhaps it was all he wished."

There is no doubt that Carlyle either did not have Schiller's book at hand, or he trusted his memory too much to look up the corresponding page. Otherwise we would be at a loss to understand that even a Carlyle could make so many mistakes in so short a phrase. After reading the History of the Thirty-Years War Carlyle probably had a vivid picture of the brilliant and chivalrous Bernhard von Weimar in his memory and considered him as the originator of this gallant motto. To be sure it was the wild and dashing Christian von Braunschweig who was so in-

fatuated with the daughter of James I, the wife of the unlucky king Frederick of Bohemia, that he had his banners embroidered with the apothem "Tout pour Dieu et pour Elle"—long before Gustavus Adolphus set foot on German soil. In addition to this historical misinformation Carlyle, in quoting from Schiller who gives the correct German version "Alles für Gott und sie!", introduces two errors. The substitution of "Ruhm" for "Gott" may have been a deliberate change, making the motto pertinent to Carlyle's case. The use of the wrong case of the pronoun and its capitalization, however, are grave grammatical mistakes which surely would be censured in any examination paper in Beginning German.

ERWIN GUSTAV GUDDE.

University of California.

BRIEF MENTION

The Poems of Cuthbert Shaw and Thomas Russell, edited by Eric Partridge (Dulau and Co., London, 1925, 165 pp.). This attractive reprint makes accessible the work of two minor eighteenth-century poets who have hitherto not received the attention they deserve. One of them, indeed, Cuthbert Shaw, has been so neglected that Mr. Partridge was unable to find three of his pieces, —*Liberty*, the *Four Farthing Candles* (a satire on Churchill), and *Corruption*. It is to be hoped that copies of these works, all of which may have been published anonymously, will be discovered since the best thing that we have of Shaw's is a satire on the writers of his day, *The Race*. The *Monody* on his dead wife, though praised by his contemporaries, leaves us cold. On the other hand, some of Russell's sonnets are still very fine, perhaps the best produced in the eighteenth century. Nearly all his poems are of interest for one reason or another,—because of the catholicity of taste they exhibit, the austere, Greek beauty of one, the variously romantic charms of others, and because they recall now Collins, now Thomas Warton, now Spenser or Milton, and again Petrarch or Cervantes.

Mr. Partridge is unaware of recent American studies in the eighteenth-century sonnet and his few critical comments are not profound. Yet he has carefully assembled the available information concerning the two poets and has added some helpful notes—more would have been welcome. It is to be hoped that the sales of this book will warrant more reprints of the kind, the poems of the elder Thomas Warton, for example, or of Bampfield.

R. D. H.

The Modern Ibsen, by Hermann J. Weigand (New York, Henry Holt and Company. 1925). Professor Weigand has in a measure done for Ibsen's principal plays what A. C. Bradley did for Shakespeare's tragedies. He has made a most careful study of the text and arrived at interpretations which if sometimes startling are never ill-considered. His book is an illustration of the dictum that a work of genius is never too old to be reinterpreted. It is straight criticism of twelve plays with an avoidance of the so-called scholarly matter of biographical and bibliographical detail and of sources and influences with their attendant footnotes and references. With most of Weigand's interpretations the reader is bound, however unwillingly at first, to agree. The rating of *The Pillars of Society* as a play lacking the finesse of Ibsen's later art, of *Ghosts* as "unsurpassed in the world's literature for sheer tragic cruelty" we accept readily, especially when we see their qualities revealed in a searching analysis. His treatment of *A Doll's House* as "comedy of the subtlest order" is a clever piece of work, but I wonder if it does not prove too much. In his anxiety to show that Nora was still very much of a doll he almost makes her the heroine of a light comedy and ignores the results of her three days of concentrated agony. It is easy to emphasize the doll traits that remain; one does not develop into complete maturity in three days. To speak of the Nora who sat across the table in her final interview with her husband as "the superior [to Torvald] if erratic individual" is to reduce the scene to a commonplace family quarrel. The effect of the play on the stage is not that, and it is to be judged primarily by the reaction of the audience. And surely Weigand stretches the bounds of comedy when he makes it include *The Wild Duck*. To say that "it is comedy from start to finish [that] Ibsen injects tragedy into comedy to make comedy the more poignant" is almost equivalent to saying that Ibsen has changed comedy into tragedy. Remove Hedwig from the play and comedy remains, but with her in the action and her death the result of the well-intentioned blundering of Greger and the crass egotism of Hjalmar the comedy is so grim that it had better be called tragedy. I must say I cannot rise to the comic heights with Professor Weigand to see anything "droll" in the contrast between Hjalmar's silence in company and his airs at home when I think of the cowardly way he ignored his father, nor can I regard his treatment of Hedwig when after his return from the banquet he gave her a menu card instead of the promised delicacies as a "humorous exhibition . . . not without a sharp sting of pathos." There is no humour in cruelly disappointing a child. That she gets over it soon because she loves her putative father far beyond his deserts does not make the cruelty less intolerable in the eyes of the audience. In Weigand's own words, "tragedy pre-

supposes the dominance of sympathy, comedy of the mood of elation, if not laughter." Where is either elation or laughter in *The Wild Duck*? A particularly fine piece of criticism is the analysis of the thought and conduct of Tesman, the husband of Hedda Gabler, after Lövborg had lost his manuscript. One would suppose that Ibsen knew all that the psycho-analysts have since revealed of the workings of the human mind so accurately has he portrayed the involutions of Tesman's. In fact, the whole book is a demonstration of the essential greatness of Ibsen's dramatic art and of his penetrating analysis of the mind of man.

J. W. T.

X . . ., Docteur ès-Lettres. *Les Variantes des Contemplations*, Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1924. In 4°, 386 pages.

X . . ., Docteur ès-Lettres. *Essai sur la Psychologie des Variantes des "Contemplations"*. Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1924. In 8°, 74 pages.

Il faut signaler aux étudiants de Victor Hugo ces deux thèses qui ne peuvent du reste suggérer, par leur nature même, aucune appréciation critique.

Ce sont des indications, ligne par ligne dans le premier volume, des variantes trouvées dans les poèmes des *Contemplations*. Des pages et des pages, des tables et des tables, avec, tout à la fin, quelques pages de notes (373-385), et à la dernière page (386) cinq vers inédits. De l'aveu de l'auteur,—d'après une 'note' pour la presse—la plus frappante révélation est que la pièce *A Villequier* avait d'abord pour titre *Un an après*.

La petite thèse n'est pas beaucoup plus révélatrice. Voici les phrases qui résument: "La plupart des variantes, quelque nombreux que soient les exemples contraires, marquent une réaction de l'intelligence sur la sensibilité" (p. 7). Cette réaction intellectuelle marque "effort vers la souplesse—vers l'ordre—vers la précision" (p. 8). Et lisons-nous encore: "Hugo, antithèse vivante, est un esprit brumeux qui tend vers la lumière. Il est né germanique, obscur . . ." (p. 8).

Veut-on un exemple de la "psychologie," voici sur *Le Revenant*:

"Un jour, jour abhorré parmi les jours funèbres . . .

"a été remplacé par:

"Un jour,—nous avons tous de ces dates funèbres!—

"Pourquoi cette correction? Simplement pour éviter d'avoir

trois fois *jour* dans le même vers, et pour que la cheville, grâce à l'exclamation sensible, fût moins apparente, cheville nécessaire d'ailleurs, car après *Un jour*, il était habile de gravement suspendre le récit pour un instant.

"Le résultat, c'est que même dans cette pièce pré-naturaliste l'allusion personnelle se glisse. Hugo semble dire à cette mère: —Insensée, qui crois que tu n'es pas moi!"

Thèse de doctorat certes très longue à faire;—mais facile.

A. S.

Students of Renaissance Latin will be interested in a reprint of Girolamo Fracastoro's dialogue *Naugerius, sive De Poetica*, with an English translation by Ruth Kelso and an introduction by Murray W. Bundy (*University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, Vol. ix, 1924. 88 pp. \$1.00). The Latin text is a facsimile of the first edition of 1555. The translation offers a fairly reliable interpretation of the general meaning, though there are not a few errors in detail. For example, the pretty little song "Huc ades, o Thelayra," is almost ruined. As an appendix, the translator adds a few pages from Pontano's *Actius*, a dialogue on the same general theme. Here both the text and the translation should have been much more carefully revised. The introduction is a very serious study of the *Naugerius*, and of its place in the history of criticism. It is an "interesting attempt at synthesis of prevailing definitions of poetry." For Fracastoro, the aim of poetry is "not primarily ethical or scientific, but aesthetic."

W. P. M.

A useful collection of significant pages is brought together in Professor G. N. Henning's *Representative Stories of Anatole France* (D. C. Heath and Co., 1924). In spite of the dedicatory Invocation from *Sur la voie glorieuse*, duly acknowledged later in the notes, this is not an authorized edition, and the range of its selections is perforce limited by the agreement now observed by French and American publishers. But that range covers over thirty years: we have here *Abeille*, two chapters of *Le livre de mon ami*, three tales from *L'étui de nacre*, including *Le procureur de Judée*, two episodes of *Pierre Nozière*, the reply of Pallas Athena from the address on Renan, *Crainquebille* and the story of Riquet with four characteristic pensées. A well-documented introduction presents the author chiefly as thinker and artist; but of course no static portrait, even in the Dutch manner, can give the student an idea of the changing romance of an intellectual evolution shown

in over half a century of published opinions. Four pages on the author's works follow the two paragraphs resuming his life: unfortunately, nothing is said about *La rôtisserie de la reine Pédauque*, *Le jardin d'Epicure*, *Le puits de sainte Claire*, *Clio*, *Histoire comique*, *Sur la pierre blanche*, *Les contes de Jacques Tournebroke*, *Les sept femmes de la Barbe-Bleue* and *La révolte des anges*. *Maxima debetur puero reverentia*! There are two portraits, including a photogravure of the fine bust by Jo Davidson, and several illustrations in muddy gouache, but the text, vocabulary and very full notes are all we should expect from the scholar who gave us the admirable *French Lyrics of the Nineteenth Century*.

Among inadvertences, a casual examination reveals the statement that the author was "Jewish by race" (xi) and that the *Légende de sainte Radegonde*, really lithographed for a few friends, was "printed" (xi); even with high school students in mind, some notes might have been omitted or at least relegated to the vocabulary: e. g. *Abeille* (199), *Bible* (204), *Judée* (208), *Moïse* (210), *Nazareth* (214), *Eve*, *Marie* (216), *arche de Noé* (222), etc. There are no notes for *renvoyer les enseignes* (106), *rouleaux*, i. e., Hebrew scrolls of the Pentateuch (111), nor for *Je n'en jeûnai pas moins* (84) nor for the conditional with *que* (45, i. 18); and neither in notes nor vocabulary appear *synecdoche* (11), *euclase* (42), *rebec*, *timbales* (49), *indigète* (103), *franc* (146), although simpler cognates are often explained with as much detail as the historical allusions. These slight blemishes however will not detract from the usefulness of this carefully edited text-book.

L. P. S.

The publication of the first fascicule (*a-abord*) of the *Glossaire des patois de la Suisse romande* (Neuchâtel and Paris, Editions Victor Attinger, 1924; 6 fr. per fascicule) is an event of prime importance for Romance philology, and indeed for linguistics in general. The *Glossaire* is the result of twenty-five years of devoted work by four well-known scholars, Professors L. Gauchat, of Zurich, J. Jeanjaquet, of Neuchâtel, E. Tappolet, of Basle, and E. Muret, of Geneva. A number of preliminary publications, such as the *Bulletin du Glossaire des patois de la Suisse romande* (1902), the *Rapports annuels de la Rédaction* (1899-1924), the remarkable *Bibliographie linguistique de la Suisse romande* of Gauchat and Jeanjaquet (2 vols., Neuchâtel, 1912-20), and a notable series of monographs and dissertations have led linguists to look forward to a lexical work of unusual completeness and accuracy. The *Glossaire* fully meets such expectations. The personal collections of the editors, together with the reports of correspondents working on *questionnaires*, have furnished an unrivaled

body of material from surviving dialects. These sources are supplemented by copious excerpts from old and modern printed texts, so that the work avoids the one-sided use of spoken material characteristic of certain scholars. The progress so achieved is indicated by the fact the *Glossaire* when complete will contain more than 50,000 words, as against 8,000 in Bridel's *Glossaire du patois de la Suisse romande* (1866). The influence of modern methods appears in the abundant utilization of place-names and family names and of maps and illustrations drawn from photographs (the latter sometimes rather sketchy). The etymological notes, usually by Professor Gauchat, are characterized by wide command of the literature, as well as by prudence and insight. The first fascicule contains detailed and valuable studies of peculiar manners and institutions in such articles as *abbaye*, *abeille*, *aberdzi*. For a custom in Wales, New England and New York analogous to the primitive usage described *s. v. aberdzi* cf. the references indicated in the *New English Dictionary*, *s. v. bundle*, *v.*, 5, and *bundling*, *sb.* The custom still exists among Swedish peasants. The verbs *abasta* and *abasti* and the related words are of interest, as Professor Gauchat remarked to the writer, as showing that **abbastare* (cf. *Romania*, XLIX [1923], 13) exists in the Franco-Provençal region.

D. S. B.

M. Jean Haust of the University of Liege has published in the *Almanach wallon* of 1924 (Editions gauloises, 9, rue Maximilien, Brussels; 6 frs.) *Pages d'anthologie wallonne, notices et traductions* (also separately, 3 fr.). This brochure of 37 octavo pages contains well-selected verses by nine poets, representative of eight varieties of Walloon. The booklet will be welcomed by all those desirous of some acquaintance with the most sharply marked and most widely cultivated of modern North French dialects. Helpful biographical and literary notes precede the extracts from each author. They are written with grace and insight. One is reminded on reading them that, despite popular misconceptions, linguistic studies need not blunt one's literary perceptions or sense of proportion. The translations are such as one would expect from a master of Walloon philology. As interest in Walloon literature in foreign countries is largely restricted to linguists, it might be well in a second and enlarged edition of this useful booklet to append brief statements of the distinguishing marks of each sub-dialect. Such notes would aid the reader in understanding the poems as well as in properly appreciating their language.

D. S. B.